DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 021 48 AL 001 349

By-Mote, F.W., Ed.
Two Conferences on Chinese Linguistics. 1966: Computers and Chinese Linguistic Research. 1967: Problems of Content and Form in the Teaching of Chinese.
Princeton Univ., N.J. Chinese Linguistics Project.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-7-0142
Pub Date [67]
Contract-OEC-1-7-070142-2985
Note-121p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.15
Descriptors-*Chinese, *Computational Linguistics, *Language Instruction, *Language Research, *Linguistics, Teaching Methods

The two Chinese Linguistics Conferences held at Princeton in October 1966 and 1967 treated respectively (1) the relevance and specific application of computer methods to the problems of Chinese Linguistics and (2) a series of interrelated problems in teaching Chinese--dictionaries, courses in classical Chinese, and methods of teaching and maintaining modern spoken Chinese. Appended are further notes concerning a students' vocabulary handbook of Chinese by the report editor, F. Mote, and other participants of the conferences. (AMM)

ED0 24021

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Report BR-7-0142
OEC-1-7-070145-2985

PA-48

TWO CONFERENCES ON CHINESE LINGUISTICS

1966: Computers and Chinese Linguistic Research
1967: Problems of Content and Form in the Teaching of Chinese

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

AL 001 349

TWO CONFERENCES ON CHINESE LINGUISTICS

1966: Computers and Chinese Linguistic Research

1967: Problems of Content and Form in the Teaching of Chinese

The Chinese Linguistics Project, based at Princeton, is a national facility designed to forward research in Chinese linguistics, to help in the training of linguists and others interested in the field, to encourage application of linguistic insights in such areas as the teaching of language and literature, and to create a repository of materials regarding Chinese linguistics.

Under subsidy by the Ford Foundation, the Project invites five or six senior and junior scholars each year to work on their own research at Princeton, constituting a Seminar. The members of the Project and Seminar for 1967-1968 are listed among the Participants at the Second Chinese Linguistics Conference. Persons interested in taking part in the activities of the Seminar or those who wish further information concerning the Project should communicate with:

Director of Research
Chinese Linguistics Project
Green Hall Annex, Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

The project publishes a pre-print series, UNICORN, largely but not entirely devoted to the products of scholars attached to the Seminar; and it also sponsors the production, printing, or reprinting of a wide variety of books. Within the first year of its existence it has subsidized the reprinting of Wang Li's Ku-tai Han-yü; supported the completion of William Wang and Anatole Lyovin's Chinese Linguistics Bibliography on Computer; and published T. T. Ch'en's Tarn Butyng, a supplementary text reader targeted on Chinese learning from the second through the fourth semester.

FOREWORD

The two Chinese Linguistics Conferences held at Princeton in October of 1966 and 1967 treated respectively A) the relevance and specific application of computer methods to the problems of Chinese Linguistics and B) a series of interrelated problems in teaching Chinese: Dictionaries, courses in classical Chinese, and methods of teaching and maintaining modern spoken Chinese.

Since the transcript of the first conference was severely abridged in preparation, it is sufficiently short so that it hardly needs further abstracting or indexing. The taping of the second conference furnished a considerably fuller and more exciting representation of the proceedings; and in order to reflect as faithfully as possible the combination of high seriousness and good humor that characterized the sessions, it was decided to give a rather full transcript, omitting only passages that were for technical reasons irretrievable and engaging in only a minimum of rewriting for cosmetic purposes. This constitutes, therefore, a fairly extensive body of discussion and does demand some sort of road-map. The four sessions offer one simple framework, though the two central sessions were on the same subject: and we have also prepared a rather sophisticated index to speeches by participants, signaling those that seemed of special interest or importance by a few words to indicate what the subject or the tenor of the remarks was. This will enable interested parties to relocate anything they recall as particularly striking, or particularly vulnerable. It should be noted, however, that no participants except those at Princeton have had the opportunity to check over the transcript; and, despite our repeated efforts to pull an accurate transcription off the tape, we may have done somebody less than total justice, though we are reasonably certain that blatant misrepresentation has been avoided.

The second conference, and the production of this report, has been accomplished under a grant from the United States Office of Education, to whom the thanks of the participants and of the Princeton Chinese Linguistics Project are due indeed.

F.W. MOTE

Participants in First Chinese Linguistics Conference

- Chao, Y.R. (University of California, Berkeley)
- Chou Kuo-ping (University of Wisconsin)
- Dobson, W. A. C. H. (University of Toronto)
- Dougherty, Ching-yi (University of California, Berkeley)
- Lee, C. Y. (Bell Telephone Laboratories)
- Lee, Francis (MIT)
- Li Fang-kuei (University of Washington)
- Liu, Eric (University of California, Davis)
- Martin, Samuel E. (Yale University)
- Pian, Rulan C. (Harvard University)
- See, Richard (National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.)
- Tsou, Benjamin (MIT)
- Wang, Fred Fang-yü (Seton Hall University)
- Wang Hao (Rockefeller University)
- Wang, William (University of California, Berkeley)
- Yang, L. S. (Harvard University)

From the Princeton University staff:

- Buhler, Roald
- Chao Pao-Chu
- Chao Yuen-ren
- Ch'en Ta-tuan
- Kao Yu-Kung
- Mote, Frederick W.
- Moulton, William G.

The First Annual
CHINESE LINGUISTICS CONFERENCE
Princeton University, October 12-13, 1966

COMPUTERS AND CHINESE LINGUISTIC RESEARCH

The opening session of the Conference on Computers and Chinese Linguistic Research, led by Professor Y. R. Chao, centered on the topic "A linguist views the possibilities of using computers in his research," in which it was hoped to identify and conceptualize problems in Chinese linguistics susceptible to application of computer techniques. In introducing the topic, Dr. Chao delineated some of the results expected from such a discussion: 1. the objective definition and basic characterization of the vocabulary for various kinds of Chinese; 2. identification of highest utility lexical elements for each such language forms; 3. statistical criteria for solving such basic theoretical problems as what constitutes a syntactic word in Chinese; 4. materials for analysis of occurrence patterns, leading to solutions of morphological and structural problems; and 5. materials for study of psycholinguistics involving, for example, the questions of stratification, of historical change in employment of words and concepts, of cultural change and of resistance to change.

Professor W. A. C. H. Dobson, University of Toronto, opened a series of brief reports by distinguishing his particular interest as being the syntax of classical Chinese. His concern with linguistics is in the degree to which it bears on the study of classical Chinese. Two possible points of discussion might concern the computer's value with regard to historical problems of stratification and periodization, including their evolutionary aspects. First, programming offers a sophisticated sampling method for the various periods under study. Second, programming imposes its own inherent logical discipline on the linguist; any intuitive approach not susceptible to mathematical formalization must be discarded. Thus he hopes for the development of a much more sophisticated technique in the study of linguistics as it applies to Chinese, because of the rigorous discipline imposed by the art of programming.

The second speaker was Li Fang-Kuei, University of Washington at Seattle, whose interest is archaic Chinese phonology and particularly the simplifying of transcription systems proposed for archaic Chinese. Although he has no personal use for computers as yet, he foresees their value in expediting and facilitating the checking of results. With several personal examples, Dr. Li pointed out that traditional scholars tend to resist the computer and are by no means convinced that it is particularly useful. He does himself feel that they are relevant in problems reducible to statistical measurements such as co-occurrence.

In suggesting three areas of computer-aided study of Chinese linguistics, Dr. Samuel Martin, Yale University, elaborated the question of co-occurrence, or "collocation," to use the British term. In the case of verbs and their objects, or adjectives and the nouns they modify, within a given linguistic context, what are the requirements of standard usage? What patterns would we expect to find and, by extension, what juxtapositions may be considered unusual? This is a study susceptible to very useful computer elaboration. A second area might be that suggested by Professor Chao: the development of criteria which would allow us to establish the syntactic boundaries and syntactic classes of Chinese. The compilation of concordances of the sort of texts useful in establishing these criteria would be one means of checking hypotheses regarding these criteria; for example, whether they are unique and recoverable or subject to certain indeterminacy and variability. Thirdly, the computer might be useful in studying the structure of modern written Chinese to determine the limits of homogeneity. Is it a single language? To the extent that it is not a single language, to what degree will it permit being treated as a single language? In this work, the computer is considerably more useful than the linguist or the native speaker, as it does not have built-in prejudices.

Considerable discussion ensued concerning a question raised by Professor W. Wang. With respect to a frequency word count, if a computer list turns out to be counter-intuitive, what then is accepted as authoritative -- the computer or the intuitive opinion of an experienced scholar? Several factors were suggested as possible causes of such a discrepancy: the size of the sample, the difference between written and spoken Chinese, the fact that experience has indicated the native speaker's intuition is often at variance with statistical results regarding word frequency. Dr. Dobson pointed out that the machine and the man should not be viewed as dichotomous. Man retains control over the machine -- it is an extension of his powers. If, as some say, there is no relevance of statistical measures to linguistic categories, then certainly there are points of interest revealed by the computer. Dr. Helm suggested that if a computer does reveal a discrepancy to intuitive opinion, then the scholar is in a position to examine the nature of this particular discrepancy. That is, as a strategy of research, the computer should be used to test hypotheses. Another point made concerning the computer's statistics versus a scholar's intuition was that the machine itself is not the determinant; it is the rationale of the sampling process which determines the computer's results.

The next report, by T. L. Mei, was read in his absence by Mrs. Pian, his colleague at Harvard University. The purpose of the report was to indicate how the phonological universals of Ferguson and Greenberg can be tested by data drawn from Mandarin and Shanghai dialects. Mrs. Pian summarized the report as follows:

a. Ferguson and Greenberg proposed the following universals of language:

1. Apart from borrowings and analogical formations, nasal vowels always result from the loss of a primary nasal consonant.

2. Nasal syllabics always result from the loss of a vowel.

3. The text frequency of nasal vowels is always less than that of oral vowels.

4. The text frequency of marked terms is always less than that of unmarked terms. This is a generalization of #3.

5. In particular, the text frequency of long vowels is always less than that of short vowels.

b. By using Y. R. Chao's *Studies in the Modern Wu Dialect*, both #1 and #2 can be validated by data drawn from the Shanghai dialects. V V VN. Examples of #1: The intermediate stage is attested in the transcription of Edkins and Karlgren; examples of #2: *m* in 嘸 and 毋 and *ng* in 魚, all result from the loss of a primary vowel.

c. It is suggested how by a joint use of Ch'en Ho-ch'in's vocabulary frequency table and computers, the text frequency of nasal vowels in Shanghai can be calculated. It is also suggested how this can be done with a speech-recognition machine.

d. #5 can be tested by studying the text frequency of Mandarin syllables respectively ending in -*in* and -*ing*. Here -*in* is considered the marked long vowel.

e. Frequency tables of sounds in Ancient Chinese are also useful for the study of sound patterns in T'ang poetry. An example is:

f. Conclusion: frequency tables are important for pure and applied linquistics and they can be most efficiently compiled by computers.

A question was raised as to Professor Mei's use of Greenberg's terms "long" and "short": whereas Mei seems to mean phonetically long and short, Greenberg meant phonemically long and short.

Support for Mei's conclusion on the relative frequency of marked and unmarked terms was cited from a Stanford University study of 8,000 words which verifies that the marked, or aspirated, term is much less by computer count. Dr. Martin commented that, even if the statistical count were opposite, it would not disprove the theory, because one might need to change the definition of the phenomena under study. The case of nasal versus oral is a clearer case for examination than that of aspirate versus unaspirated.

Dr. Chao asked why Ferguson and Greenberg used text frequency rather than lexical occurrence. Dr. W. Wang replied that, because language changes through use, text frequency is a better index of the frequency of usage, and so of the degree of susceptibility to change. He also offered evidence counter to the hope that statistical counts can be useful in studying sound change. A Ph.D. thesis on Germanic linguistics by Robert King at the University of Wisconsin shows very little correlation between computed functional load on available texts and the actual nature of sound changes.

Professor Martin expressed doubt concerning Universals 3, 4, and 5, which are said to be hypothetical. Some Arabic dialects, for example, have more long vowels than short; and in some languages, the short vowel may be the marked term. This problem might be met by restating the hypotheses.

Dr. Chao questioned the difference between Mandarin finals -in and -ing. Dr. William Wang related his findings that in the Peking dialect, in the final -in, the duration of the vowel is twice as long as that of the consonant; in the final -ing the length of the vowel is half that of the consonant.

In opening his report, William Wang emphasized the importance of creativity, the development of individuality of viewpoint in the study of Chinese linguistics. At the same time, he does not oppose the use of the computer as a research tool to increase the pace of work. He described a number of projects undertaken at the University of California at Berkeley that are relevant to the discussion. One has been the development of a coding system for Chinese characters. This system is intended to allow a native speaker to convert characters into alphanumeric representations, which can later be converted back to characters. This is a fundamental task to enable computers to work on texts written in Chinese. One attempt at constructing such a coding system is Professor Charles Li's Sinotype system, now being modified at Berkeley. There is also in preparation a bibliography of Chinese linguistics by W. Wang and Anatole Lyovin. (Previous work in this direction was done in a series of mongraphs by the Chinese language society of Japan and in a section of Schaefer's bibliography on Sino-Tibetan linguistics, neither of which is up to date.) At Berkeley the computer program devised and set up is flexible enough to include frequent updating and contains a topical cross-reference, as well as numerous abstracts. Another project at Berkeley is a machine translation project begun several years ago by Sidney Lamb, but carried out mostly under the direction of Mrs. Ching-yi Dougherty. A final project is the coding of a phonetic dictionary of Chinese dialects (the Hanyu Fangyin Zihui) so that dialect studies can be aided by quick computer look-ups.

Commenting on the broad framework of Chinese linguistics, Dr. Wang suggested that such problems as coding Chinese characters, machine translation, frequency lists for pedagogical materials, computer recognition of Chinese speech may all be thought of as problems in applied linguistics. That is, they make use of results distilled by means of linguistic analysis. In addition to these applied goals, there is the field of Chinese linguistics proper, as a discipline. It may be considered to have two aspects: First, the humanistic interest -- that which exists for its own sake, generated by the abundance of material on Chinese culture in general. The main issues are syntactic and phonologic description of various dialect structures, and historical evolution of present dialects. Second, Chinese linguistics as a contributor to the field of general linguistics. Very little substantive knowledge in the framework of general linguistics draws from Chinese linguistics. It is essential that general linguistics satisfactorily represent the Chinese area if one is to appreciate the full range and diversity of human language.

Dr. W. Wang was questioned about his remark that Charles Li's system of character coding was as yet unsatisfactory. He replied that the system's basic problem is ambiguity between highly frequent characters: if only stroke count and linear sequence are used to encode, certain frequent characters will have the same code: *ren* 人 , *ba* 八 , *ruh* 入 or, if, as is true of the Lee-Caldwell system developed at M.I.T., one ignores the relative length of strokes (that is, whether or not they cross), then other frequent characters will be confused in code: *tyan* 田 , *jea* 甲 , *shen* 申 . Thus, to encode for programming a rhyme dictionary, such as *jyiyunn* 集韻 , the extensive subconfigurations necessary to include the over 50,000 characters would result in lengthy and unwieldy coding as well as much antiquity.

One participant verified the problem of ambiguity in coding through his experience with the RCA "photo computer," and suggested that coding Chinese characters only on the basis of form and sequence of strokes will lead to ambiguity. It was pointed out, however, that this line of development of computer usage is not rendered valueless by the difficulty of coding. Present optical scanners can read English; undoubtedly, more advanced scanners will be able to solve the problem of form as a determinant of coding. Dr. W. Wang commented that this is basically not a problem of linguistics; within that field it is more important to be concerned about the phonology, syntax and semantics of the language. He reported that there are groups studying the computer manipulation of Chinese characters, such as that led by Prof. Susumu Kuno at Harvard.

L. S. Yang, Harvard University, reported on his study of negation in Chinese thought and linguistics. His particular interest is in cases of multi-negative structures and situations, of which he has found many examples in both classical and colloquial languages. This seems to him to be a fruitful approach to the study of Chinese, and he foresees great computer usefulness in organizing the quantities of material fundamental to the study. His investigation has led him to the notion of ambiguity as studied by T. L. Mei, and specifically to the issue of reversibility. With the use of frequent examples, Dr. Yang described some of the points of his study. In the case of *Bugaan buchiuh*: "we don't dare not to go" (i. e., "we must go"), the word order is irreversible. On the other hand, *buhao buchiuh*: is reversible. He cited other examples of reversibility with a change of meaning depending on a pause, and gave instances of multiple (more than two) negatives within a series. In conclusion he suggested that the linguistic task in this case is to broaden the theoretical concept of these "no-x" structures. The computer, assuming it had assimilated the literature involved, might be asked to give all examples of more than one occurrence of the type of word in which one was interested. This would lead to more refined studies of grammar and phonetics within a narrow focus -- perhaps a more worthwhile task for the computer than compiling a concordance.

The ensuing discussion explored one of the differences between Chinese and English which permit multi-negation. Reversibility is permitted by a feature of Chinese grammar not found in English; that is, a string of elements in Chinese can each take a negative. English, for instance, permits only one negative in any phrase; thus, reversibility in English occurs only as a concomitant of ambiguous reference by the negative. In addition, "*buh*" is more widely used in Chinese than is "not" in English, principally because Chinese has no prefix corresponding to the English "un-" or "dis-." With regard to Dr. Yang's concluding remark, it was noted that the primary task with regard to the computer must be encoding; secondly the compiling of a concordance; then studies such as this might profitably follow. Several subjects for computer study were suggested: One might examine redundancy in Chinese. Within a given amount of text, what are the constraints on the choice of the next word? It was also queried whether the computer might not be used to distinguish the meanings of semantically different multiple-negation expressions. Wtih regard to this, it was pointed out that it is extremely costly to organize a sufficiently large sample on the computer to cover all the specific elements of structure that one might want to study. Even a one-million word sample is small. In general sampling will show that a few things are happening only infrequently and that many things are not occurring at all. A final point was that the computer simply organizes large quantities of data. There is a tendency to force these data into a pattern. Thus, the computer results must be analyzed extremely critically, or parallels might appear that are not, in actuality, valid.

The concluding speaker of this session was Dr. Frederick Mote, who outlined the projected plan for the East Asian Linguistics Project at Princeton. In 1967, it is expected that a professional Chinese linguist will be in residence at the University. In general the project will be modeled on the Institute for Advanced Studies; it would offer researchers a year of study and colloquia in residence. While the project will be concerned with pure research in its seminar the particular interest of the staff segment will be applied linguistics. The Ford Foundation grant will be used to supply support for visiting scholars in residence to carry on their own research. In addition the project hopes to identify people interested in linguistics and to increase their number by encouraging others to enter the field. Those who might come to Princeton would include: postdoctoral non-specialists who wish to enter the field; advanced students of linguistics; and specialists in the field.

The research activity will pursue both the interests of the Fellows of the Project and those other long-term aims of the Project. That is, there must be some kind of continuing research activity within the staff segment of the project which should relate to practical problems of learning and teaching Chinese. (This would not be an adjunct to the teaching program of the University.) Preliminary discussions with computer experts concerning initial problems of computer use have indicated the need for some kind of overview of the kinds of problems susceptible to computer use. It is hoped that the discussions of the present Conference will produce this overview and enable the Project to settle on a fruitful research plan.

II

The opening speaker of the second session ws Mr. C. Y. Lee of Bell Telephone Laboratories. He elaborated some of the questions that might be solved by a computer, as well as some of the problems facing those who would use it. The computer, as he and his colleagues think of it, is useful not for its independent operation but as an extension of human faculties. It extends man's powers of processing data by a factor of 10^6. Some of the large projects in which Bell Laboratories have used the computer are the following: Since a computer is in effect a data processer, it may be used to simulate a proposed telephone system in order to anticipate problems which might arise in the new system. The computer may be used to compile programs for a telephone system. This electronic system of a telephone network is itself, in a sense, a computer with a program of 10^5 words. Computers search large reservoirs of accumulated data for specific information. The computer has been used to make a model of a switching network in order to allow technicians to see connection patterns -- a project that would otherwise require 20,000 lines on paper for visual inspection.

Despite the usefulness of the computer, one must also evaluate its proportionate expense in time. One can expect a single programmer to turn out about 1,000 words per year of useful program. Only about 5 to 10 percent of the yearly product of a single programmer can be integrated usefully in a large system. Mr. Lee indicated that it would not be unrealistic to expect a large program to involve more than 300 man/years. Thus, one must think in terms of a large-scale system for a large task. He emphasized that prospective users of the computer should try the machine themselves for the benefit of experience; otherwise they may be unrealistically overawed by the machine. It is important to see just what the machine can do, rather than simply to accept the results as presented by other people.

Mr. Helm emphasized Mr. Lee's final comments and pointed out that there are programming languages now available (e.g. Snobol) the use of which takes only a small effort to learn.

Dr. Eric Liu described a research project, using the computer, undertaken by him and his colleagues at Stanford. Although there are many uses for the computer, he said, word frequency study seems to be one of the main concerns. The preparation of data in a productive format for future problems is a very significant and difficult process, which is compounded by the lack of understanding between Chinese linguists and computer programmers. Eventually, linguists will have some sophistication with regard to computer languages and can design a format in the most productive manner. At present, word count is the easiest and most natural thing to do with the data. In the project at the Stanford Computation Center, a 250,000 word sample from Modern Chinese was assembled approximately evenly from five areas: fiction, drama, essays, periodicals, and technical sources. In this case a word was considered not as just the simple Chinese character but as consisting of two parts: 1. its lexical character -- that is, phonemic and tonal elements, which are described alphanumerically; and 2. functional class -- that is, its syntactical category, which for these purposes were 10 in number. Five taped frequency word lists were generated, one for each genre used as a source of vocabulary. The five lists were then merged, and three co-efficients were used to determine the structure of Chinese vocabulary. These were:

1. Frequency: the total number of co-occurrences of each word in the universe of the five lists.

2. Dispersion: a rating from 0 to 1 to indicate the pattern of distribution between the fields. 0 indicates that a word occurs in only one of the five fields; 1 that it occurs with even distribution between them.

3. Usage: dispersion as a corrective to frequency, and vice versa.

Finally, the first 3,000 words in the list were ranked in decreasing order in the hierarchy of these 3 coefficients, and a brief analysis was made.

The next speaker was Benjamin Tsou. He pointed out two projects specifically dealing with the storage and retrieval faculty of the computer. The first, a M.I.T. thesis by Frank Liu, is the development of a Chinese handwriting recognition machine. The input is handwriting of Chinese characters on a screen of 5000 meshed areas, which the machine characterizes by several determinants such as slope, curve, direction of slant. The machine reproduces the character visually for correction.* The second project is a phonetic typewriter. A prototype of a machine with a phonetic output has been developed by a Mr. Wang in Viet Nam. Coding Chinese characters is the input problem here. By interchanging drums with various phonetic transformation elements, various phonetic inputs could refer to given characters, thus permitting inputs from various dialects.

In addition to these problems of input and output, Mr. Tsou remarked, are the philosophical problems of the application of the computer to linguistics, that is the use of the computer to examine the nature of language as a system. One orientation for research might be along the lines of William Wang's remarks during the first session concerning Chinese linguistics as an area of general linguistics. A project carred out in 1963 showed that computer-generated sentences might be satisfactory grammatically, but unsatisfactory idiomatically and semantically. This indicates that much work is to be done in the logistics of linguistics before the computer can be utilized adequately. In addition, the computer might be applied in generating onomatopoeic Chinese poetry -- mirror image lines, or fricatives or sibilants for onomatopoeic effect. Another use might be parsing sentences and generating matching sentences. One could thus perform predictive analysis: What must follow a given output? Analysis by synthesis would also be possible; that is, once the machine has generated a sentence, the process of seeking a matching sentence would reveal the structure history behind it. (At present this is time-consuming; it may sometimes take as much as an hour to find a match.) The computer generation of parallel sentences is the mechanical analogue to the human process of translation. This would lead to eventual machine translation. With regard to linguists' expectations of the computer, Mr. Tsou concluded, man can remember more than the machine. The advantage of the machine is in its speed as a retriever of information.

---

*By fall 1967, this work had been finished but had not furnished any very useful result.

Sample Sentences Generated by Computer

1. 大花底老愛情不是大的
ta hua di lao ai-ging bu shi da de
The old love of the big flower is not big

2. 我們不是波士頓來過的人
Wo-men bu shi bo-shi-dun lai guo de ren
We are not the ones who have been here in Boston

3. 你可能不是王先生
ni ke-neng bu shi Wang-Xian-sheng
You may not be Mr. Wang

4. 他們也許是去過月亮的人
ta-men ye-xue shi qu-guo yue-liang de ren
They may be the ones who have been to the moon

5. 他們吃衣服
ta-men chi yi-fu
They eat clothes

6. 我不是真的
wo bu shi zhen de
I am not real. (also: What I said is not true.)

7. 大家吃衣服
da-jia chi yi-fu
All of us eat clothes

8. 你們追求桌子
ni-men zhui-qiu zhuoz
You go after tables

9. 你們應當是月亮去過的
ni-men ying-dang shi yue-liang qu-guo de
You should be the ones who have been to the moon

10. 那去過火星的王小姐看花一定是假的
na qu-quo huo-Xing de Wang-Xiao-jie kan hua yi-ding shi jia de
That Miss Wang who has been to Mars looks at flowers should be false

11. 去過哈佛街的李學生追求衣服不是真的
qu-guo ha-fu-jie de li-xue-sheng zhui-qiu yi-fu bu shi zhen de
That student Li who has been to Harvard Street goes after clothes is not true

12. 我是吃過艱難苦頭的人
wo shi chi-guo jian-nan ku-tou de ren
I am one who has tasted the bitterness of poverty

III

The opening speaker of the third session was Mrs. Ching-yi Dougherty, who has been involved with the Chinese Machine Translation Project at the University of California at Berkeley since its commencement. Research efforts there have been concentrated on the analysis of Chinese syntax, the work being done in sufficient detail so that the linguistic data derived from it can be formalized and manipulated by the computer. Three purposes have been achieved more or less satisfactorily: 1) classification of lexemes, 2) formulation of syntactic rules, and 3) differentiation of sememes. Chinese characters usually have more than one meaning. The different meanings of a given character can be differentiated by their environments. Where this is possible they are differentiated by different grammar codes, or by listing with their environments in the dictionary. There is now enough formalized linguistic information on Chinese to experiment with automatic parsing, which is being done with the help of the automatic parser at the Linguistic Research Center at the University of Texas. Simple and compound sentences have been successfully parsed; only the embedded sentences with de(s) produced many ambiguities. Once a sentence is successfully parsed by the automatic parser, the syntactic function of each lexeme in that sentence is determined. It is feasible now to devise a system to bring out the English gloss which corresponds to the syntactic code of a lexeme which is used in the structure of the sentence. How an English sentence can be generated from the given information is the object of future research. The groundwork has thus been laid for machine translation in Chinese. But a great deal of detailed work must be done before this becomes a reality.

The next speaker was Prof. Fred Fang-yü Wang, Seton Hall University, who has been concerned with the problem of character recognition by computer. He distinguished at the outset between character recognition and character production, which is a more complicated process requiring a more sophisticated technique of analysis. In dealing with the difficulty of problem components -- that is, those cases where distinctions exist on the basis of different stroke order or different stroke form -- these were exhaustively listed. Before going on to coding, the encoder would learn and eliminate such cases -- thus cutting down the number of code numbers. Coding the characters affords a close analysis of them, and points out where problems, and areas for further study, lie. Mr. F. Wang discussed the attempt of the Japanese to reform the writing of Chinese characters through standardization, limitation, and simplification. The Chinese Communists, beginning 9 years after the Japanese effort at simplification, made a deliberate attempt to differentiate their method from the earlier one. Nevertheless both systems used traditional etymologies and had many similarities. Mr. Wang urged that the present coding problems be attacked using new, independent etymologies.

In discussing the report Dr. William Wang suggested that the speaker's method of coding for recognition went beyond the limits of analysis by strokes only and was involved with the general configuration of the Chinese character. One problem in this extension of view is that the more general the view, the greater the intrinsic ambiguity. On the other hand, a system with less ambiguity would increase the encoder's difficulty in learning the coding system.

It was pointed out that a researcher at Bell Laboratories has employed cathode ray tubes to describe a page of printed matter (in English) by a photographic process, and that this might have value for character recognition. In answer to a response that the number of distinct Chinese characters is too great to lend itself to this process, it was suggested that the computer might be used to list all the possible ways of writing the characters that have variant forms.

The question was raised whether, given a variety of coding structures, a nonlinguist (familiar with the Chinese language) could be taught a coding scheme in a short time. Charles N. Li at Berkeley had informally tested several rather unmotivated people in this respect and found that a modified Sino-type system could be learned in 2 or 3 days. IBM also trained an individual -- unfamiliar with the language -- to code 30 Chinese characters per minute, with the use of a dictionary and without regard to grammar, etc.

Mr. Richard See (NSF) emphasized that, in thinking about coding systems, it is important to remember the particular purpose involved in the development of the various systems of identification which have been under discussion here. For instance, the Chicoder, an RCA machine, was developed by Army contract, not to select Chinese characters, but specifically for printing them. He warned against the frequent tendency to link techniques of printing with those for selection, which is not necessary. The two processes should be divorced.

Stromberg-Carlson has built a printing machine for Chinese characters which puts codes in an electronic tube. Thus far, however, the task of coding up and entering the code on the tube has only been done on a sample basis. Dr. Chao queried the cost of encoding 1600 characters for this printing system. In his system of general Chinese, tong tzyh, 通字 which is a system of substitution by phonetic and etymological principles, one character could be used for all cases in which a word may be written variously but identically pronounced in the major dialects. The result is a list of 1400 distinct syllables, representing 1650 characters which would do the job of all Chinese characters. Mr. See answered that the photon equipment is immediately available for coding 1650 characters at a cost of about $10,000. Dr. Chao added that tong tzyh is a visionary system, not for immediate use. While it makes easier the task of the beginning language student, it increases the burden of the advanced reader in distinguishing ambiguities.

Prof. Fred Wang concluded by pointing out the problems facing a teacher of Chinese: In the morphology of Chinese characters, what are the interchangeable elements? What elements are distinct, not interchangeable. The teacher must analyze which components are used most frequently in Chinese characters and start to teach these elements. Coding systems and code analysis of components will be of great usefulness.

The next speaker was Prof. Francis Lee, of M.I.T., who presented an engineer's point of view with regard to the value of the computer in the study of Chinese linguistics. Reality, he stated, requires some compromises with intellectual theory in such cases as parsing and character recognition.

The machine demands a precision of linguistic concepts that may not be necessary or desirable in a classroom. He emphasized that the computer language used should be oriented to the field of research in question. One new computer language, SNOBOL, is easy to learn and has already been used by linguists. The language can be learned in a week, although it may take longer to become proficient. SNOBOL was designed for use with strings of symbols and would prove cumbersome if one sought to break down symbols, say in a phonology study.

In speaking of computer memory, Dr. Lee said that high-speed cores are too costly for lexicon storage because of the very large capacity needed. Discs or drums, with their greater capacity, will give sufficiently fast access to lexicons.

In the ensuing discussion, it was suggested that the major problem in computer study of Chinese linguistics is the creation of a lexicon or series of lexicons with data structured so that, according to the questions most likely to be asked, the parameters permit easy access to the data. Commenting on this, Mr. See urged caution in setting up large stores of data before anticipating the questions which will be asked the computer. One should proceed gradually in setting up the data bank.

Professor Mote asked whether an input of separate Chinese characters does not provide the greatest flexibility in retrieval? If lexemes are the unit of entry, the coder's decisions on linguistic issues may be challenged by other users of the system, and thus the system may not be generally acceptable to the widest range of possible users. He feels that, to construct a system useful for all purposes, the individual character must be the basic unit of entry and retrieval. Others agreed with him but suggested that entries need not be limited to individual characters: for example igonq would be a single entry; chih, che, and chihche might be three separate entries. Since it was agreed that, for purposes of storage, a slow speed core would be adequate, the size of storage is not severely limited and can include the basic characters as well as their compounds, all as single entry units.

At this point, Mr. See remarked that there seem to be two kinds of information being discussed: raw data -- drawn from a text -- and refined data -- drawn from a dictionary. The latter type is the more difficult to deal with because it is already in a refined form and may require transformation in order to be used in the computers. Do scholars need raw data? Studies in storing Russian concluded that it is not at all certain that a very large store of running text is useful to scholars. This does not necessarily apply to refined data. Discussion of storage problems, thus, should distinguish between these two types. Professor Martin doubted the advisability of large all-purpose stores of data -- as tending to cause the machine to dominate the man in usage.

Suggesting that it is perhaps useful to start research from a problem orientation, Dr. William Wang proposed two experiments:

1. To analyze a collection of raw material as it comes out of China; for example, the Hann Yeu Tzyh Huey 漢語字彙 .

The indexing system of this lexicon, however, is rather complicated since it uses *yunn muh* 韻目 in the modern Peking pronunciation as the index for the Chinese characters. If one were to use the *Jong guu* 中古 coding scheme, which takes the *deeng* 等, *sheng* 聲, *faanchieh* 反切, etc., and phonetic representations in the seventeen dialects contained in the *Tzyh Huey*, then the computer can analyze combinations of initials and finals in a given dialect and their distribution throughout various dialects.

2. One might put the *Jyi Yunn* 集韻 in the computer to replicate Ch'en Li's experiment in connecting *faanchieh* characters to establish homonym classes.

All of this data might form part of a larger corpus available for future work.

Hao Wang reported his experience in using computers in the field of mathematics. He found that learning to program is easy and even enjoyable. With regard to the accumulation of results, he stressed that the computer work should be repeatable, as it is in other scientific studies. That is, the methods used to obtain results must be presented in reports of those results, and they must not be *ad hoc*. Whereas the computer can be readily used by mathematics students for certain types of problems, Professor Wang warned of the difficulty in evaluating new results of a linguistics student who does a computer research topic instead of a theoretical topic. In general, one should be certain that computer usage is relevant to the research problem; the computer should not be used just because it is available. The scholar may find computer results frustrating in that they do not have the clarity of theoretical results.

In concluding the Conference, Professor Mote expressed the hope that the East Asian Linguistic Project will become a clearing-house for information of interest to Chinese linguists and, with its group of resident researchers, a ground for continuing basic and applied research in the field.

Participants and Observers at Second Chinese Linguistics Conference

Bodman, Nicholas C.	Cornell University
Chao, Yuen-ren	University of California, Berkeley
Ch'en, Leo	San Francisco State College
Chou Kuo-p'ing	University of Wisconsin
Dew, James E.	University of Michigan
Dien, Albert E.	Columbia University
Ellegiers, Daniel	University of Brussels/Ghent
Hanan, Patrick D.	Stanford University
Kratochvil, Paul	University of Cambridge
Liu Chun-jo	University of Minnesota
Malmqvist, Göran D. N.	University of Stockholm
McCoy, W. J. Jr.	Cornell University
Pian, Rulan C.	Harvard University
Rickett, C. Allyn (2nd day only)	University of Pennsylvania
Shih Chung-wen	George Washington University
Stimson, Hugh M.	Yale University
Wrenn, James J.	Brown University
Yang Lien-sheng	Harvard University

Members of Princeton Faculty and Chinese Linguistics Project

Ballard, William L.	Chinese Linguistics Project (Berkeley)
Chao Jung-lang	Chinese Linguistics Project (Hamburg)
Ch'en, Stella En-ch'i	Oriental Studies
Ch'en Ta-tuan	Chinese Linguistics Project
Gillooly, Peter N.	Chinese Linguistics Project (Washington)
Harvey, John	Oriental Studies
Kao Yu-kung	Oriental Studies
Kierman, Frank A. Jr.	Chinese Linguistics Project
Mei Tsu-lin	Chinese Linguistics Project (Harvard)
Mote, Frederick W.	Chinese Linguistics Project
Moulton, William G.	Linguistics Program
Norman, Jerry	Chinese Linguistics Project
T'ang Hai-t'ao	Oriental Studies
T'ang, H. T. (Mrs.)	Chinese Linguistics Project
Tu Wei-ming	Oriental Studies
Worthy, E. H. (Mrs.)	Oriental Studies
Yang Shih-feng	Chinese Linguistics Project (Academia Sinica)

Observers

Chu, Charles J.	Connecticut College
Eng, Helen K. C. (Mrs.)	Defense Department
Gould, Sidney	American Mathematical Society
Liang, James	University of Pennsylvania
McCaskey, Michael	University of Maryland
Ruhlmann, Robert	University of Paris/Columbia
Schoon, Annabel (Mrs.)	Defense Language Institute
See, Richard (1st day only)	National Science Foundation

THE SECOND CHINESE LINGUISTICS CONFERENCE

October 10-12, 1967

PROBLEMS OF CONTENT AND FORM IN THE TEACHING OF CHINESE

The Sessions:

Tuesday, October 10: Some Problems of Lexicon (Afternoon session)

Wednesday, October 11: The Teaching of Classical Chinese (Morning and afternoon sessions)

Thursday, October 12: Problems of Vernacular Chinese -- Blind Ends and Open Roads in the Teaching of Modern Chinese (Morning session)

PREFATORY NOTE

In editing the transcript, we have adopted the strategy of using Wade-Giles romanization for names of persons and for titles of books or sections of books, and Gwoyeu Romatzyh ("The National Romanization") invented by Dr. Y. R. Chao for the romanization of Chinese words or expressions cited in the course of discussion.

The sessions of the 1967 Chinese Linguistics Conference were held in the Senate Chamber of Whig Hall, starting at 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 10. Professor Frederick W. Mote opened the first session with a general welcome to the participants and observers.

First day, afternoon: Some Problems of Lexicon

Mote

The agenda subject for today is lexicology. I have already given most of you, I think, a copy of my written apology for having failed to clarify that topic better in preliminary communications with you. Many of you have come here with serious and large problems of lexicology in mind, and there are some distinguished lexicographers sitting around the table. We hope to draw on that experience and upon the serious thinking which you have done on the problems of that field. At the same time I suggest that our immediate need is a narrowly focused and practical one, and we have a house interest in getting that sort of direction and advice from all of you. I think I won't say anything more about the definition of the problem, hoping you have read the statements and will feel strongly moved to disagree with our own point of view or react to it in some way or another. But I will ask Jerry Norman to make a summary statement about the problems that have emerged from reviewing the sample entries which had been submitted as of late last night.

Norman

The present idea for compiling a student's glossary has grown out of the experience of teaching Chinese here at Princeton and out of discussions within the Linguistics Project. The members of the teaching staff and some of the participants in the Project feel that such a glossary, containing perhaps three thousand characters, more or less, and giving the sort of information that the second- to fourth-year student would require in his studies, would be an undertaking both useful and manageable within a short period of time. Such a glossary would be expected to get a student from the beginning level to one where he could use Chinese native reference works, such as the Han-yü Tz'u-tien, and others. And with such a glossary available, the compilation of various types of teaching materials could be made easier and more systematic. The glossary would contain those characters which the student would meet most frequently in his classroom reading. In the sort of teaching materials we have in mind, there are edited and annotated texts for intermediate and advanced students, notes which would have to be provided for those items not adequately accounted for in the glossary. This is all explained further in Professor Mote's paper, which you have. Sample dictionary entries were solicited from the participants of this conference. As of yesterday, only five such entries had been received. This is at least partly due to the vagueness of the original solicitation. We hope Professor Mote's written explanation [Attachment A] will have cleared up some of that vagueness.

The five samples which we did receive are most interesting because of their diversity. Before I summarize these, I should mention that we received from Dr. Paul Kratochvil of Cambridge University a letter which raises some very basic questions about the idea of a Chinese-English glossary or dictionary. Not even a sample entry can be attempted until these primary issues are discussed and decided, according to Dr. Kratochvil. The pertinent parts of this letter have been reproduced [Attachment B] and we commend his comments to your attention.

Only one of the sample entries was limited entirely to classical Chinese. This is the entry of Professor Yang Lien-sheng of Harvard. [Attachment C] His entries, and I say entries because he added two other characters in addition to the character shu in order to illustrate different types of lexical difficulties, are constructed so as to give the student reader a very detailed view of the usages of the characters in literary Chinese of various periods and in various types of writing. Colloquial meanings are not included, presumably because these have already been treated in his and Dr. Y. R. Chao's Concise Dictionary. Professor Stimson's entry [Attachment D] is similar, and he gives numerous examples of usage in classical and literary texts. Unlike Professor Yang, however, he includes colloquial meanings. The entry composed by Professor Mote* is of somewhat different nature. He has illustrated various semantic aspects of the character shu with compounds drawn from both the classical literary language and from modern vernacular. Somewhat like Professor Mote's is the entry sent in by Professor C. W. Shih [Attachment F] In her entry meanings are mainly illustrated through compounds. In fact Professor Shih's entry is essentially a presentation of forms compounded from the morpheme shu much like a Chinese traditional tsyrdean. The samples of Professor Malmqvist [Attachment G] contain both classical literary and colloquial meanings of the characters. He also includes an extra character, I believe to demonstrate the sort of difficulties that one encounters with the so-called function words. In his sample character, the meanings are illustrated in well-known compounds. Professor Malmqvist's samples contain the most elaborate grammatical treatment of the five entries which I saw yesterday. Every separate meaning is accompanied by designation of grammatical class taken from Y. R. Chao's *Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. "Measures" (classifiers or numerary adjuncts) are given in the case of colloquial meanings, as they are also in the entries of Professor Stimson, Professor Shih, and Professor Mote.

---

* Attachment E

All entries include simplified characters where they exist. Most entries use the G. R. romanization for the main entry, but the *pin-yin*, the Wade-Giles and Yale were also given in some of them. Professor Mote and Professor Malmqvist thought that the four-corner system should be included, no doubt because of the numerous reference works which still appear using that system. Professor Malmqvist suggests a rather elaborate apparatus containing an introduction with information concerning important lexical sources such as the *Dai Kanwa Jiten* of Morohashi, *Han-yü Tz'u-tien*, *Kuo-yü tz'u-tien*, *Grammata Serica* and so forth. He would also have references within the body of the dictionary to various of Karlgren's works, such as the *Glosses on the Shih-ching* and references to a compendium at the end of the work for function words in both ancient and modern languages. It would thus be almost a guide to sinology for students at the elementary level.

A reading of these five entries raises some interesting questions about Chinese-English dictionaries and glossaries in general. Some of these questions are very basic. The content of the entries will depend largely on the person for whom the glossary or dictionary is written. For students in a program which stresses modern Chinese, and in which the teaching of classical Chinese is considered secondary, a dictionary which stresses the colloquial is obviously required, and the reverse is also true. I think the sample entries illustrate this problem very well. Another question is to what extent the glossary should be a guide to other works or even a general elementary guide to sinology. What should be the principle on which compounds are entered, if indeed they are to be included at all? In all the sample entries, except those of Professor Shih, the compounds are used for illustrative purpose only. Another very basic problem is to what extent the dictionary can serve as a student's guide to usage. Yesterday in a conference I had with Professor Mote and some of the Chinese teaching staff here, we discussed, for example, the students' frequent misuse of the two words *niann* 念 and *shyue*. 學 I myself suspect that the solution to a problem of this sort is probably more complicated than one would think at first glance, and that dealing with such things might lead a dictionary compiler far afield. How many characters should the glossary contain? This is another basic question. What criteria of selection are we to use? This last question cannot be simply solved by saying that we are going to do a frequency count, since the frequency will of course depend to a large measure on what material is used. To what extent can we use the material in Wang Li's *Ku-tai Han-yü*? These are all questions we hope to discuss today. The differences in the sample entries have undoubtedly arisen from the various experiences of their compilers, both as students and as teachers. We trust that among the participants of this conference today there will be still other ideas which have arisen from different experiences.

Yang It is a slight misunderstanding to call my entries completely wenyan. I do stress the wenyan use, in that the two new characters I selected do happen to have more or multiple meanings in wenyan, that is why I selected them. But for the character shu, I don't think that even people who want to stress colloquial could add more definitions. And also for shu, like shuo-shu 說書 that kind of early bairhuah, was used originally in speaking since Sung times. A number of compounds, like shenchiingshu 申請書, are obviously modern. You do not find such a compound in pre-19th century documents, as far as I know. It is very difficult to distinguish wenyan from bairhuah in many cases. So it is actually arbitrary to draw the line in too clearcut a manner.

Also I want to explain that, wherever I use the square brackets, I imply that the information may be excluded if you think the whole thing is going a little bit too far, giving too many details.

I also make a distinction between the compounds that are rough equivalents to the definition there. For example, I define Shu as the Book of History or the Book of Documents. Ancient texts use shu by itself to mean the Book of History or the Book of Documents; and Shang Shu or Shu ching are actually later expanded forms of the old term. Therefore, shu should be defined in that way.

In certain cases, as after the Book of History or Book of Documents and after "to write" shushiee 書寫, the explanations preceded by "as" are illustrative definitions and not intended as equivalents. So "a history", as Ch'ien Han Shu or Hou Han Shu, can occur in many other compounds. I know there are limitations in using this technique because sometimes you simply cannot find a compound very close to the definition. Actually we used this technique to some extent in a small dictionary, the Concise Chao-Yang Dictionary of Spoken Chinese. I believe use of this tool can be helpful to students who want to explain the term in Chinese by giving a compound roughly equivalent to the definition.

Chao There are various problems of method and principle involved in compiling such a dictionary or glossary. One, which we have been discussing, is the separation of the literary and the colloquial. One way to mark it, as I have been doing in connection with some reading material I have been compiling, is to mark the whole item of vocabulary with an "L" if it is used only in wenyan. Thus any item unmarked is a spoken form.

However, a great many compounds used in everyday speech consist of parts which are not free, or are not used in the same sense except in wenyan. For example shu as "book," is spoken; but as the verb "to write" it is definitely capital "L". However, if you talk about calligraphy, the only thing you can call it is shufaa 書法. Even though shu is thus used in the literary sense, as "writing" in that compound, the active term is part of the spoken vocabulary. Likewise, shenchiingshu 申請書, a letter of application, an application: That is the only way we can speak of shenchiingshu in everyday speech, even though shen is not used independently in the spoken language or shu in that sense. These compounds would be left unmarked, even though some of the parts may serve in meanings which would be wenyan and therefore marked "L".

There are of course compounds which, as compounds, are still only used in wenyan, not in everyday speech. Such compounds would be marked separately, as "L". Let us take jiaw-shu 校書 (literary: "correct proof") for an example; but it also means "sing-song girls". In present-day speech you do not speak of them as jiaw-shu any more. So if you include such items at all, then the compound as a whole should be marked "L". What I am driving at is that one must make a distinction between compounds which are used in everyday speech (unmarked), even though parts of them may be learned or literary, and those other purely literary compounds which are never spoken.

Yang Another supplement. On my submission I have also used some minor signs, as in the jiin, 儘 where the 'j' should be underlined because it's voiced, as we have done in the small dictionary. Under 節 jye there should be a dot (a "sharp" to indicate the dental origin of the initial) and a small "t" at the shoulder (to show that it originally had a final "t"). Such features can be very helpful to students; and such additions as the dots and small 't' at the shoulder won't cost very much.

Mote This raises a question Professor Malmqvist has also raised. How much phonological information is useful to a student at this stage? You and Dr. Chao, I take it agree that at least this much should be retained. Is there discussion of this point perhaps?

Stimson I should like to see it retained too. But for your first example, jiin, I would like also to see an exclamation point in parenthesis afterward to show that it irregularly retains the third tone. That would at least point out to the students that something is funny here and they would not get too confused.

Discussion on this subject continued briefly, essentially concluding that phonological signs are useful adjuncts to glossary markings.

Mote Are we thinking to include such marks, then, because they are useful to the students in these years of their language learning, or because they commend themselves for some other reason? Practically speaking, do students use this sort of information at this stage?

Chao Certainly they would use it for classical poetry ...

Mote True, that does come into second-year wenyan, in the sequence of courses we have in mind.

Yang As soon as you talk about older Chinese or dialects, you run into this sort of problem. Many writers still use systems of transcription that preserve distinctions on which such information would help the student -- Karlgren, for example -- and there is also the peculiar arrangement of the Mathews dictionary due to such factors.

Chao By the way, Mathews has had a very special history of publication. Among other things, it was the first time a book published in Shanghai was pirated in this country by Harvard. Then Taiwan repirated it. But apart from that it does have a special history, because when it was compiled during the years 1919 and 1932, they worked with that artificial *gwoin* system with all sorts of arbitrary distinctions, including KI, TSI, HSI and so forth, separating all such sounds into different groups. Then, before the book was actually published, they got word that the Ministry of Education was going to change over to the Peiping pronunciation, not making such distinctions as between "sharp" and "rounded." So they tried to put the whole thing into Wade; but a lot of the type had already been set and it would have been too expensive to reset the whole thing. So they kept the grouping but changed the headings. Thus the sharp and round are separated but the groupings follow Wade.

Malmqvist You might, incidentally, be interested to know that in 1962 Mathews, at the age of well over 90, got an honorary doctorate from Melbourne University, perhaps in compensation for not having received those royalties. (Laughter)

Prof. Mote says in his notes here that the vocabulary handbook should serve the student from the very beginning, from the second year through his fourth or fifth year. I wonder whether there might be some danger of keeping him from very useful dictionaries such as the *Han-yü tz'u-tien*, *Tz'u-hai*, *Kuo-yü tz'u-tien*, and *Dai kanwa jiten*. I think the sooner the student can turn to these works the better. And here is the dilemma: The better this dictionary, the longer the delay for the students.

Chao So you mean that we had better compile it poorly! (Laughter)

Malmqvist Yes, I suppose that is one way of putting it.

Mote I quite agree. We have said here, we hope the student will gladly abandon this, sooner rather than later. But is there apt to be a transitional period in which the student will use the *Han-yü tz'u-tien* insofar as he can but would still have to rely on this for certainty at some points? Or am I over-extending the possible use of this dictionary? In principle we quite agree: The sooner he uses Chinese dictionaries, the better.

Chao There is one point about using Chinese dictionaries. When I was on the Committee for the *Kuo-yü tz'u-tien* in Peking, the question arose what to include and we tried to include everything. I always reminded the other members to include those things which seemed obvious for them and which are items of frequent occurrence in the language. Because everybody knows these things, they don't bother to include them. For example, the *Tz'u Hai* includes those items which a Chinese user would be likely to look up; but there may be a lot of compounds which Chinese would surely know but foreign students would not. Such items should be included in dictionaries for the use of Western students, though they are missing in most Chinese dictionaries, including the *Kuo-yü tz'u-tien*.

Kratochvil I feel I should really apologize for my written contribution, which seems to be of a slightly offensive nature. But I think Prof. Mote's statement renders most of my remarks pointless. In any case, perhaps I should make another point. The purpose as I understand it from the statement is not altogether clear. If one should use a label for a vocabulary of this sort, I think something like "compact initial manual" will do, and I should stress the word "compact", because I think the desire is to have a highly organized and relatively small-sized handbook of a very precise scope.

This brings us to the problem which I brought up in my letter: The question of frame of reference. I understand again that the frame of reference is to be somewhat limited. But it is in any case already very complex by its nature: Basically it sets out to include the vocabulary of at least two distinct written styles, which partly overlap in their form and content. Now to compile a compact handbook on the basis of such an obviously complex frame of reference is a formidable task indeed. Those of us who have done any dictionary compiling at all will perhaps agree that to compile a relatively small dictionary of this sort is incomparably more difficult than doing a large dictionary based on a homogeneous frame of reference.

In my opinion there is some danger involved in the proposition as it stands now, since something will quite likely have to suffer in the long run. Can I perhaps put it in this way? 3,000 basic characters are quite a lot and I think the number is justified. I wouldn't like it smaller. Now if this structure of the individual items within the vocabulary is such as actually to fulfill the tasks outlined in the statement and still remain clear, this would mean quite a lot of space. Notice, for instance, the size of the item shu in Prof. Mote's sample, which I think would in fact have to be even larger in order to satisfy all the aspirations expressed in the statement. This would mean that what starts out as a manual would grow into a couple of volumes. My somewhat involuntary experience of five years of dictionary-making is that, in a situation of this sort, the authors do in fact usually tend to sacrifice something of the original plan; and I don't think this pattern should be repeated each time a new dictionary is compiled.

In summary I am not at all sure that the statement is absolutely realistic in its combination of features to include and this general idea of compactness. I think the purposes are unnecessarily great and too many. I am not at all sure that the Project could actually fulfill them.

Mote May I ask which of these you would abandon first?

Kratochvil It depends. I think if I am right you would have to give up one of the two main principles, perhaps the complexity of the frame of reference: Something like dropping classical Chinese, which I don't think would happen. Now if this didn't happen, then I think the desires as expressed in the statement would be cut down in size. The documentation of the individual items would become very scanty. I don't think there is any other way out of it.

Mote In addition to considering this as an exercise in lexicography, we might also consider something that hasn't come into the discussion yet this afternoon, and that is its intended function in relation to a body of teaching texts. With this in hand, the glossing and footnoting in those texts can be reduced, as the most repetitious items in such glossing and footnote can be eliminated entirely. I suspect that in order to achieve that function for it we would make sacrifices in the ideal pattern accordingly. Your fear is, I suppose, that it would destroy the value of the work.

Kratochvil Not at all. What I fear is that a lot of labor in compiling such works is often lost in the very beginning because the design is such that it cannot be brought to a conclusion. The result often is that 80 percent of the first year or two's labor must be just chucked out.

Chao I wonder whether a good deal of the complexity would come from the phonological and graphical details. These two aspects really concern, in most cases, just single characters rather than compounds, so that you wouldn't need to repeat all that information for compounds.

Kratochvil Yes, but wouldn't you agree, Prof. Chao, that intrinsically, as the project is outlined here, it does involve materials of great complexity? When you were compiling the Concise Dictionary of Spoken Chinese, you were actually operating within a very homogeneous frame of reference, relatively speaking.

Chao Yes. Strictly speaking, that dictionary has no compounds except to illustrate the use of single items.

Kratochvil I think in the long run, what you might end up with might actually be something like a revised Mathews, if you were not careful.

Mote If I may describe it a little differently, what we may have in mind, as my sample entry here reflects, is really an abridged version of the Han-yü tz'u-tien with English notes. To a certain extent, that is. That work makes no distinction between various levels of Chinese: Vernacular and literary, for example. It does not divide the compounds into groups that illustrate the different meanings or definitions of the words. But all the material really comes from that. I would prefer that to a revised Mathews myself.

Liu How about simply translating the Kuo-yü tz'u-tien?

Mote Well, you have perhaps heard the history of that project. An idea, not a product on paper to date. Would Mr. Mei make a statement?

Mei Yes. To try to translate the Han-yü tz'u-tien, based on my preliminary estimate, would require something like 20 man-years, and this would be too expensive in terms of manpower and money. And most of all the patience of those who initially will participate enthusiastically would probably run out towards its end. This 20 man-years is a very optimistic estimate. For such a project one must usually add at least half again to it, and that comes to 30 man-years. There simply are not 30 man-years willingly available.

Stimson Could I ask a question? Do you think that a dictionary which gave under each entry the chief meanings with one or two illustrative examples would help the student to read a Chinese dictionary, which would be his actual main source for translating texts? This would, in other words, be a sort of guide to another Chinese-Chinese dictionary.

Chao A large ZH Guide?

Stimson Right.

Mote Could that function with respect to this body of teaching materials in the manner I have set forth?

Stimson I suppose what I am suggesting is that you have two: One the compact affair we are talking about today and the other Chinese-Chinese, and then you could use both as backup for your notes and just give extra glosses for things they don't specifically cover.

Dien I wonder whether you mean that through the fifth year the students will be reading controlled texts that are assigned to them or that by the fifth year the students will be reading freely on the basis of personal judgment and interest. In the second eventuality you cannot foresee what he will need, nor use such unassigned texts as the basis for such dictionary.

Mote This wouldn't be planned to satisfy all the student's needs for five years. It is only planned to accompany certain formal courses that he may take during as long as five years.

Dien If it is to accompany a controlled course and you know what materials he will be reading, the number of entries, for example, would be a function of the materials that you meet in that course.

Mote That doesn't mean that all the material accompanying the course will be listed in the dictionary, but only that of highest utility. Of course, the text will still be glossed for the other items that go beyond the specific scope of the general glossary.

Dien I wonder also about the lexical contents of the dictionary. That is, what are you teaching the students by the etymological investigation of the individual character? Should this be the depository of knowledge of that sort or should that be kept for the glosses that go along with the text? Or do you intend to have the information available in both places?

Mote We have been discussing just that and I don't pretend to have a set answer. It is an area where we are soliciting your opinions.

Hanan If this glossary is tied to a body of texts, does it mean that you have abandoned the idea of a frequency count?

Mote No. What is the difference between the frequency count analysis of Chinese lexicon and a closed body of texts? We have been using the term "characters of highest utility". How is "utility" determined? Wang Li in his *ch'ang-yung tz'u* 常 用 詞 uses a purely subjective standard -- probably rather accurate, but purely subjective. If you match that list with objectively-derived list, you will find some very surprising omissions.

Hanan Yes, I see. The original amount of data comes from a specified text?

Mote Not so. We plan to define "highest utility" by a computerized count of very large samples of running text and we plan to match that against Wang Li's list. Exactly what principle we will then use for deciding what to include may not be strictly mechanical. That is, we may decide that to be strictly mechanical in listing only the 1,500 characters of the highest frequency would be self-defeating. We may adjust it somewhat, but it will be determined more or less along those lines.

Chao As far as objective standards of selection are concerned, they can sometimes be misleading, too. I remember when I first looked at the *I-tzu ch'ang-p'ien* of the *Chung-kuo ta tz'u-tien* (Commercial Press), it had something like 5,837 compounds, but I couldn't find *iseel* 一死兒 (insistently) -- because it's not in the text they happened to be using. People don't write the term very often, though one says it all the time.

(In further discussion, Prof. Mote clarified the fact that the frequency-count will be of MVL, that no immediate plans are set to do a comparable objective count of *wenyan*, and that the objective results will certainly have to be supplemented for various reasons.

Prof. Yang suggested that some indication of priority among characters can be derived simply by a rough scanning of existing short Chinese dictionaries, to see how relatively extensive the entries are.)

Mote But I am reluctant to trust the judgment of the editors of the Commercial Press and Chung-hua Shu-chü of thirty years ago to understand our needs completely; and secondly, isn't it possible that the length of an entry is a function of the complexity of meaning it has acquired rather ...

Yang That is important. If one can use so many meanings, obviously they must appear in so many contexts. That is one thing you have to assume.

Mote Well, as a practical point it is well worth considering and that we should check against that method ...

Yang I have no doubt at all that computer will prove this point.

Mote We hope to be able to subject it to just that proof.

Dien Can we start laying our bets, by the way? (Laughter)

Kratochvil I think when it comes to using mono-lingual dictionaries as a basis for consideration, this is probably also related to the possibility of translating modern bi-lingual dictionaries. We should be extremely cautious, whatever we do. Translating a dictionary is a lexicographer's nightmare.

If the bi-lingual dictionary is based on a word list in language "A", and is to be translated into language "B", then language "B" may well require, let us say, greater stress on some items than language "A" does. When we use such dictionaries as Hsüeh-sheng tzu-tien or Hsüeh-sheng tz'u-tien, the complexity of some items is presently right for the speaker of Chinese who uses it and for whom it was designed; but a much greater or much lesser complexity may be required for language "B". We have problems like this all over the place. Thus we should be cautious in translating mono-lingual dictionaries.

Mote I might call your attention to Prof. Kratochvil's article on the problems of compiling a Chinese-Czech dictionary in Archiv Orientalni. It is a very useful discussion of problems of this kind.

I have a feeling that many of you would like to challenge the project itself in more fundamental terms than you have yet done.

(Mr. James Liang discussed problems of correct usage and how such a dictionary might set about protecting students against solecisms.)

Stimson We're still getting back to exactly what kind of book this is. It seems to me there are three questions: Is it to be a dictionary that will help students in composition and in speaking Chinese? Is it a dictionary that will help in a particular project? Or is it a general dictionary? Or, of course, is it some combination of these?

Chao In connection with the matter of adding illustration, which some think may take a lot of space. Perhaps one can choose between using illustration and getting the grammatical categories of various items, whichever is simpler, more direct, and shorter. For example shu jyi -- we could very often have an abbreviation for collective nouns -- there are so many of them which cannot be used with individual classifiers; and if you mark it "collective", then it means "books" in a collective sense and you don't particularly need an example. In other cases, possibly a phrase containing the term would automatically define its grammatical function unambiguously.

Malmqvist If this is meant to be a guide to students, why not ask the students to give us some comments on what they expect to find in a dictionary?

Mote Mr. Baron, what do you want a dictionary to do for you?

Baron I want it to give me a good idea of pronunciation -- entries which have several pronunciations are confusing -- and what meanings are associated with those pronunciations. I want it to give me more compounds than most dictionaries do now. And of course grammatical category, and what sort of context a given meaning occurs in.

Mote Mr. Baron is beginning third-year Chinese here. How about Mr. Edgren, though he is hardly a student.

Edgren O, very much so. It depends again on the purpose of the dictionary. If it is to accompany a set of texts through a period of study to be used consistently, then the scope should be very easy to determine and in that case more space could be devoted to explaining the use of really difficult or obscure words, or expressions, as Wang Li does in his books. But he is discussing specific texts and talking, after each section of his words, about what differences or divergencies are encountered in using certain terms or groups of terms. If the dictionary is limited to a programed set of texts, then, it should be much easier to prepare a handbook for it. If on the other hand it is for students' general reading, rather free, unrestricted or undetermined readings, then of course the scope is practically unlimited and probably the project impossible to accomplish, no matter how large it is. Again I am not entirely sure what the purpose is, but I would think that anything but a handbook to accompany a fixed group of texts would be almost impossible with respect to man-hours required. I think that people have been talking very seriously about the problem of compiling a nearly complete dictionary; and that may be something which can never be solved. If the scope is limited, then it shouldn't be too hard to determine what data should accompany particular character entries and compound entries.

Kao I would like to point out that, in Prof. Mote's sample of shujyi 書籍 and shujiuann 書 卷 , he did make some attempt to classify them as generic terms. Thus, you cannot say i-been shujyi , simply because shujyi is a generic term. No matter how many sentences are used to illustrate a word, if you don't use the right one, you still cannot achieve the purpose.

Malmqvist I have learned from the Chairman that this Project is envisaged to be completed in a year or two. I find myself strongly in support of the views expressed by Prof. Stimson a moment ago, that the dictionary should include all the possible definitions and grammatical functions of the form, but with very few examples illustrating each function; and it would help the students to go to other dictionaries, already possessing some basic knowledge to guide him around in those other dictionaries. If you can do that in two years, you will really have done a lot.

Yang I think some basic knowledge of how a compound is formed should be given rather than numerous illustrations. For example, in shubeen 書本 , been is a measure word, and there are numerous other compounds formed that way. I doubt very much that it is necessary to list them all. In particular, for terms like shudiann 書店 or buhdiann 布 店 , it would be much better to explain the character diann than to list all the kinds of commodities a store might carry.

Stimson We have a witness here to a problem, our third year student of a few moments ago, who doesn't want to use two dictionaries. He should be encouraged to use two, but it's very hard to get students to do this. If Mathews is around, with all those listings, they will use that as their first dictionary. This is too bad, because it keeps them away from the Chinese dictionaries that much longer. That's just the problem.

Kratochvil I very much agree with Prof. Malmqvist, but I fear that this would in fact mean -- aside from compiling a dictionary -- also writing two or three grammars. Very soon, I hope, we will have a grammar of spoken Chinese -- if a copy ever appears. (Laughter: Prof. Chao's grammar has been in the press for several years.)

Mote To sum up at this point, our discussion has covered the problems of how many compounds a dictionary needs to include, how they should be selected, and how to indicate grammatical function of words. If anyone has a statement which could help us in coming to a position on any of these issues I would appreciate it. There are also many matters so far not touched: The problem of format, for example. We solicit comment from anyone experienced in format, which might make the dictionary easier to use and more meaningful.

Kierman Robert Ruhlmann and James Liang and I dreamed up an idea that might help compromise the issue of how you illustrate what you mean and still keep things relatively compact. If you had one or several very fully covered characters, where you try to be as exhaustive as possible, like the Harvard-Yenching fascicles, and then within this very full definition, by diacritical marks or other notations, indicate which items you would select for the dictionary, you could thus encourage the user to perceive how you have tried to hit the center of the semantic range of that character as a compound form. Then, whether that is done as a part of the introduction, or as one of the actual definitions in the glossary, or in a separate companion volume -- the ZH Guide type of thing -- this would perhaps make it possible to use a relatively small number of examples while at the same time illustrating the way in which those examples could be understood for the general body of characters.

Mote Are you speaking of semantics only or also of grammatical function?

Kierman Both.

Mote We have thought that it might be a useful device to have something like an inner dictionary for words of the very highest utility and outer one for words of the second rank, dealing of course with the former more exhaustively. I don't know how practical that is. Perhaps the decision will have to be deferred until after we have set up some kind of experimentation with models.

Chao For grammatical function, I still feel that on the whole you will probably save space by giving suitable brief examples except for some characters of the very highest frequency and most obvious importance. You can also make certain marks like 'vi' and 'vt', though even this does involve theoretical problems.

Kratochvil I think that we are basically in agreement concerning the two most useful ways to indicate grammatical category: Either by giving it a label to place it in some sort of abstract general category, or by giving an example. Now I wonder whether the two ways might possibly be combined. That is, giving the abstract grammatical category wherever possible, when one doesn't feel he is getting into a dangerous position by committing himself; and when this is not possible, solve the problem by giving examples. If you assign a category, you are saying that this item has all the features of all the other members in that category. This may be true or not true; or -- true or not -- you may be in no position to assert it. However, if you give an example, you are telling the user of the dictionary: This item has certain features in this particular sentence, and if you want to draw a general conclusion from the fact, that's your business. I really wonder if these two could be combined by giving general direction where possible and where it is not possible, simply retreating into example.

Mote Do you have an example in mind? Is there any dictionary that seeks to follow this pattern?

Kratochvil No, I don't know of any that do just what I suggest. Of course, there are dictionaries which follow either way; and then there is Kuraishi Takeshiro's Chūgokugo Jiten, which more or less does both at the same time. He has examples for most items, and for all -- both those he gives examples for and those he doesn't -- he gives a category. So he does both.

Chao The Commercial Press in the past put out a Chinese-English dictionary with tzuoh-wen chyou-jiee in the title, a double-function dictionary to explain what things mean and then to show how actually they are translated -- the two things are not always the same. The tzuoh-wen part, that is the active part, is expressed more clearly by the grammatical function. As I said some time ago, if the example given implies the function clearly enough, you can omit the categorization.

(Mr. James Liang pointed out that the protean quality of Chinese syntax makes strict grammatical labeling risky and sometimes misleading; Prof. Mote pointed out that, this glossary not being intended either for elementary students or for self-study, that risk should be minimal.)

Mote It is assumed that the students have learned the basic idiosyncrasies of the language through an extensive first-year course in which a considerable vocabulary has been introduced and grammatical patterns are well learned. This book will function in such a way as to allow the students to extend their knowledge by analogy to a larger vocabulary rather than supply them from the beginning with this knowledge about the stuff of language.

Dien Dr. Chao mentioned synthesizable compounds which can be logically analyzed by the students: Once you know one such, you needn't look up others. When you ask how many compounds should be in the handbook, there seems to me a kind of assumption that if a student knows the area of meaning of A and the area of meaning of B, he will be able to understand the meaning of A plus B. If this is the assumption, then the number of compounds needed are only those which need illustrations. My question is: Is this true? And if so, what percentage of compounds can be thus analyzed by students on the basis of such knowledge?

Chao It depends on which you think is more important, composition of compounds or comprehension of them. If it is for comprehension, perhaps few compounds are needed. For instance, like 書店 , if you know the meaning of shu and diann then you know what shudiann is. If it is for composition, possibly students will make up compounds that simply do not exist. In my experience, the percentage of compounds in texts which can be readily analyzed by students is less than 50% of any dictionary. Considering this discussion, would it be suitable to have two or three, maybe four or five of us, work on some sample entries for a brief period? And see how it could work out.

Mote Do you mean during the conference?

Chao No.

Mote Good -- I could see us staying up all night. (Laughter) That seems an excellent suggestion and if the guidelines can be made concrete enough, we will try to meet them very specifically.

Dew I'm having a certain amount of trouble changing focus, since I've been thinking for some weeks about a dictionary and am now asked to shift to thinking of a handbook. I wonder if this sacrifice is necessary. Can't something be done with all the work to serve wider purposes than just a handbook largely limited to serving a single curriculum?

(Prof. Malmqvist asked what had happened to a Columbia project for compiling a dictionary out of the Chao-Yang product and two others. Prof. Dien said it had been finished and showed a copy, plus another shorter -- 1500-word -- high school dictionary. Prof. Yang recommended that the format of certain very compact Japanese multi-lingual dictionaries be studied.)

Mote Getting back to Mr. Dew's point, I think it obvious that the need for dictionaries of many kinds and of several levels is very great. I'm inclined to think that any steps we take in the direction of such a practical project as this will contribute to the other in some way. The suggestion is an ingenious one: To take an existing dictionary of very high quality, that we approve of, and supplement it to serve our needs. However, the strategy of problem-solving must be investigated, partly using Columbia's experience to guide us. But whether or not we could at this stage enlarge the purposes and try to create a general dictionary, even by that method, I am doubtful. I think that it will take more time than we calculate. We have a practical need which must be served first and hopefully it will also contribute to the larger problem you pose. If Michigan has more manpower available and a more ingenious strategy to apply in compiling a general dictionary, we may never have to do this.

Chao I have another idea, which I don't recommend. (Laughter) If I were a commercial publisher preparing to publish a small-scale dictionary of two or three thousand characters, I would add almost twice as many characters with very perfunctory definitions and then advertise it as a dictionary of five or six thousand characters. (Laughter) You get a more saleable product with very little effort.

Yang I am in favor of a readable dictionary, containing readable entries, which will readily give students who read them the feel of those characters. This is the most urgently needed item among students, especially in their third year.

Mote Are you thinking of format or content?

Yang Both. I believe there already exist a number of pretty good dictionaries for compounds, both mono-lingual in Chinese language and bi-lingual. But there is not a single good Chinese-English dictionary for classical Chinese, not even anything remotely comparable to Couvreur. So I think if you start with Wang Li's *ch'ang-yung-tz'u* sections and expand these characters to something between 1,500 and 2,000; give basic definitions of them; and then force students to memorize about one third of them in classical Chinese, their knowledge of modern compounds will improve correspondingly. I believe this is the most strategic and urgent thing to do, even if you start with only 1,500 characters. You can leave out the obsolete definitions. And this can certainly be done in two or three years.

Stimson Two features of the Couvreur Dictionary are well worth considering: One is quotation from the earliest source for a given meaning, so that you know at what time a particular usage begins; another is that everything he gives, whether compound or quotation, has a transliteration so that you can read it at once.

Mote However, I think Couvreur accomplished this simply by cribbing from the *P'ei-wen Yun-fu*. And since then many of the points he sets out have been overthrown, challenged or supplemented.

Yang Couvreur is not that bad. I think you are doing injustice to him.

Stimson I was speaking in principle, anyway, not suggesting wholesale use of Couvreur.

Mote If there is any easy source to crib from, I quite agree that we should do it. If there isn't, I don't think we can have much new input, new problem-solving, at this point. We can't ask anyone to do new research into the history of a particular word just for the needs of this dictionary-compiling effort.

Edgren I would like to know if it has been decided or suggested that the glossary or handbook be divided into at least two categories, one dealing with literary Chinese and the other with colloquial Chinese, rather than have the distinctions made within the body of definition of one character. It would perhaps be desirable to have them separated, since the courses are taught separately. If the glossary for literary texts were concentrated upon, this might be easier to cope with, since the number of items could be smaller. Although the methods of teaching are quite different, as someone has just suggested, it would seem difficult to derive something applicable to all situations; but the texts that are used to teach literary Chinese are quite limited and rather regular. People don't stray too far from a limited array of texts. Perhaps it might be easier to cope with this first step by itself. And I should think that most educators might feel this more fundamental and important to beginning students, especially undergraduates. (Long silence) I didn't mean to shatter the proceedings. (Laughter)

Mote I guess nobody can think of anything equally profound.

Ruhlmann I have something profound. (Laughter) The distinction you propose between an inner dictionary and an outer one, or an inner and an outer set of materials: I wonder if we might agree tomorrow on defining a set of *wenyan* texts for students of various levels. Once that corpus is agreed upon, one could do an inner dictionary of limited scope which could be the common dictionary for all those texts. As for words or compounds which occur in only one or two of those texts, or in ancient or odd contexts, they would not be in the dictionary at all but in glossaries appended to each individual text.

Mote You have anticipated some of what we plan to say tomorrow, regarding the *Ku-tai Han-yü*.

Ruhlmann If we decided on that, it would mean that the committee would publish two things: One is a textbook giving a number of sample texts, each one with its glossary containing rare words, and the other would be a dictionary with relatively common ones.

Mote The main difference is that you have thought to use the readings actually in the *Ku-tai Han-yü* as your control. We had planned to use another kind of control which might be more widely useful.

What I'm going to do next is not fair, but I notice that Dr. Chao has made a list of notes which may represent a kind of summary of the points we have talked about today. I would like to ask Dr. Chao to make a summary statement if it is convenient to do so.

Chao No, these aren't summary notes, but items for comment, and I've covered them all. However, I have the impression that most people have not objected strongly to our proposal of giving examples if the grammatical function is sufficiently implied in them, so as to save space and include more items. As for the inclusion of the colloquial and literary, there are some differences of view; but I hope I am right in getting the impression that we would like to include both. As to the individual items, whether single characters or compounds, it seems generally agreed that both literary and colloquial compounds should be included, except that -- in terms of the corpus we have in view -- compounds which are rare, with not only the characters but also the compounds falling outside the corpus, could then be excluded.

The two aspects, the active and passive, *tzuoh-wen* *chyou-jiee*, the *tzuoh-wen* or active knowledge of writing or speaking, would in many cases emerge out of the explicit grammatical definitions or out of definition by example. But I would recommend that some attention be given to active use just because so far dictionaries have emphasized the explicative aspect perhaps too much. As for the phonological part, this has to do more with individual characters and graphical variations, rather than compounds; and it would perhaps not involve too much expenditure of space. In all these points it seems that I recommend inclusions rather than exclusions. I hope this is a general summary of points that we have just discussed.

Kao The idea of compiling a glossary handbook was initiated by a group of faculty members led by Prof. T. T. Ch'en. The handbook was meant to be something like Modern English Usage or The King's English. That is why it was intended to include 1,000 or 1,500 characters. We planned to make it a readable dictionary that people could enjoy and benefit from. But now it seems to me that this vocabulary handbook has become larger and larger and has deviated from our original idea, though still very useful.

Mote It seems to me that the principal unsolved problem is that of size. (BELL, outside) But the bell tolls (laughter), and I think we had better adjourn.

B]

Second day, morning:

The Teaching of Classical Chinese

Mote I should commence by expressing gratitude to you all for yesterday's discussion concerning dictionaries, or glossaries, or whatever name we finally decided upon. I myself feel much better informed on the subject than before, and I think it was in general an interesting and useful discussion, giving much more focus to our own thinking about the practical problems of our enterprise than we had before.

Afterwards several people mentioned things that we had failed to bring up. A number of people praised the Walter Simon dictionary and wondered why it hadn't been mentioned, since it has been used a good deal in American universities. Professor Ellegiers mentioned the new Chinese-Latin dictionary, the first item in the quinta-lingual series from the Jesuits at Taichung. He is fortunate in having students who can use a Chinese-Latin dictionary. Most of us don't. In fact, most of us teachers of Chinese would hate to have to pass a test on using one ourselves. It is, however, the first of a series, two of the others being Chinese-French and Chinese-English, and that does add a large body of dictionary material recently and competently compiled.

Today we will turn to the subject of the teaching of classical Chinese and try to focus on the problems raised by the experience of using the Ku-tai Han-yü. I should like to impose the following format on the discussions, so if you have comments that are going to fit one part of it or another, perhaps you can plan them accordingly. First, we'll simply discuss KTHY as a book, a sinological work, and second, we'll go on to the subject of how it might relate to our problems of teaching classical Chinese.

Several people have asked how the reprinting of this edition of the KTHY was accomplished in Hong Kong. I think it might be an interesting subject to begin with. As you all know, the two parts of Vol. I appeared in 1961. It was readily available in Hong Kong bookstores, and became widely known then in Europe, America and Japan, and widely used as a textbook. We didn't adopt it here until 1965. In 1964 the two much fatter parts of Vol. II appeared in China and we read about the considerable discussions of them in the Chinese press. Such a debate aroused our curiosity, but we never saw the book itself. We wrote to friends in Europe who had better contacts with mainland sources of books than we have, and to Japan; but everybody insisted that it had never been seen. We wrote friends in Hong Kong; but there was simply no scent of Vol. II even there.

It then occurred to Dr. Kierman, who had attended the Junior Sinologists conference in Denmark during the summer of 1966 and had there met Professor Malmqvist, that in view of recent Swedish book-buying trips to mainland China and their known bibliographical interests, Stockholm might be a likely place to look. It turned out that there were in fact several copies of Volume II in Stockholm; and through negotiations with Professor Malmqvist and Mr. Edgren we managed to borrow one with the express purpose of having it photocopied and republished for general use.

As soon as we were assured that we had a copy in our hands which could be used for reprinting purposes, then a copy mysteriously appeared in Hong Kong. I have no doubt that, if we hadn't found a copy ourselves, that copy would never have emerged. As a precaution, we photocopied Professor Malmqvist's copy but simply held it here in case pages were missing from the Hong Kong volume or it were needed in some other way. It wasn't, in fact needed. The Hong Kong owner made his copy available to Lung Men Bookstore for reprinting; and we subsidized this republication.

Lung Men, as you know, is a very reliable reprinter. They use good paper and do their work very carefully. They spend lots of time and trouble collating the works that they reprint; but they are expensive, and without subsidy the book would have been priced out of sight. We felt it was of sufficient value as a teaching tool and of sufficient interest to the sinological world that it merited our subsidy; and with that subsidy we got a number of sets which we are not permitted -- by agreement with Lung Men -- to sell but which we can use for our own students; and we have taken gift copies for you from that small stock. Otherwise, the book is now available at $12.00, which is reasonable for Lung Men prices. I think we should express our gratitude to Prof. Malmqvist and Mr. Edgren for their help in this.

At the same time the Lung Men people, realizing our interest in the debate this book has produced in Mainland China, have produced a small collection of essays from the Chinese press regarding the KTHY. This isn't all the essays: Many of those not included were much more critical than those reprinted here. I think Lung Men wanted to protect their investment a little. (Laughter)

Prof. Yang Lien-sheng has made a critical examination of this volume, and he followed the debate on KTHY as it appeared in the press. He has agreed to make some remarks on the nature of the book.

Yang

The book in my hand is called Ku-tai Han-yü ti chiao-hsüeh-fa ho shu-p'ing 古代漢語的教學法和書評, and it is a collection of articles from a periodical called Chung-Kuo yü-wen 中國語文, Nos. 122, 136, 137, 138 and 140. The first article is written by Wang Li himself. The other four are all pretty good -- although highly critical, also complimentary of KTHY in many ways. Anyone who wants to use the KTHY must read this collection of reviews.

As we would expect, the first part of each review starts with the usual ideology: How much consideration has been given to Marxism and Leninism and Maoism; what is the ideology of the contents -- the standard of selection, whether the contents tend to be too pessimistic, particularly towards literature and art, or whether the doctrine is overwhelmingly shyh-guu fei-jin 是古非今 [affirming the old and negating the new]. On the other hand, each of the reviews,but especially the later ones, are largely devoted to the scientific side; and some of their remarks are very good indeed, including textual criticism, comments on vocabulary (whether it is over-sophisticated, overdone, or underdone) and on whether the selection of the Ch'ang-yung-tz'u [often-used words]was just right or whether they include too many unnecessay characters (such as ney 内 and way 外 , koou 口 and eel 耳 , dih 帝 and how 后) that don't need any explanation or should for other reasons be eliminated. They also point out lots of minor mistakes, including inconsistency in punctuation (sometimes the same text is punctuated three or four different ways in different places). On the whole these points are quite well taken.

I would like to add a few remarks of my own on the KTHY. In the first place I have the notion that Wang Li probably changed his mind about the definition of the KTHY in the course of compiling the three volumes. If you read only the first volume, you have the feeling that he will deal only with Pre-T'ang and T'ang texts; but suddenly in the third volume you find much more recent literature, such as Yuan drama and Sung or even later texts. My first feeling was that he is not going to deal with the older *bairhuah* of the Sung and Yuan periods. As a whole the third volume is rather weak as compared with the first and second.

One of the general weaknesses is that each unit tends to cover just one book; but the books are not all of the same difficulty, and some of the more difficult works tend to appear early, while some of the easier ones may appear later. And for some of the items they select too few samples. From *Mo Tzu*, for example, I think they select just one passage. On this score the book is rather uneven. Also the assumption that in any one book the style will be uniform, that any one book is by a single author -- that is a very dangerous assumption. Some scholars want to distinguish the early *Analects* from the later *Analects* -- the first ten chapters of the *Lun Yü* from the second ten, where you can find certain differences. If I were to make use of KTHY, for teaching Chinese to foreign students, I would probably move back and forth instead of following the original order.

Also I have the feeling that, although the comments are very good, somehow they fail to call attention to works done by modern scholars, and of course they completely ignore the works of Western scholars. For example, in the discussion of the particle *ian* and *yan* [as two words both written by the character 焉], all of us know of George Kennedy's contribution: That is a landmark. Such articles as those by Prof. Simon (especially the short ones, such as that on *bii* 比) are excellent articles. The definitions of certain terms in KTHY are not so good as those in such articles. *Ian* could be simplified as 'where' or, in most cases, 'there', and this is a much simpler way of handling it than what Wang Li has done. Even modern Chinese scholarship has been slighted, as for example Ting Sheng-shu, whom Wang Li doesn't mention.

There are certain additional questions for which Wang Li's discussions are not the best available. In *Meng Tzu* there is *wang wenn chern* 王問臣 (Your Majesty has asked me) rather than *wang wenn yu chern* 王問於臣, which would have been common for the *Lun Yü*. You will find numerous examples, in translating Buddhist texts from the Six Dynasties and T'ang periods, of ordinary transitive verbs plus *yu* 於 then taking objects. In Yuan drama there was *tzay yu menshoou* 在於門首 and those who love Chinese opera should remember *chiuannjiee yu ta* 勸解於他. You can say *chiuann ta* 勸他, but on the stage it has to be *chiuannjiee yu ta*. 勸解於他.

I think it is the duty of the teacher, even at the high school or college level, to call the attention of the students to the peculiar usage of such characters as this *yu*. Similarly, the difference between *hu* 乎 and *yu* 與 is that *hu* 乎 is used for ordinary questions and *yu* 與 is used for endings like "Isn't that so". These are the kinds of character which often baffle students. Also *hu* 乎 : 90 out of a 100 times this means *yu jy* 於 之 . If stress is laid on these rather than on things which I believe the commentators have over-done -- like rituals -- students would definitely be benefited. I think if KTHY is to be used as a textbook, studies made by modern scholars, both Chinese and non-Chinese (Western and Japanese), should be incorporated so as to make it a still better tool.

Mote Are there any other comments regarding the KTHY.

Malmqvist I should like to return to these criticisms of the work in the reviews. I should think it would be highly useful if a list could be made up of all the mistakes pointed out in these reviews, a list that could be handed out to students so that they could carry over the corrections to their own copies. This could be done very easily; but without it there might be a lot of needless difficulty in having them use the volume on their own.

Stimson How about errata?

Mote The errata sheet appeared only for Volume I; and Lung Men did bind this in, at the end of that volume. As you know if you followed the controversy, Volume I was thoroughly revised by a working committee on the Mainland in the course of its compilation. But the two parts of Volume II were not subjected to that process of revision. As soon as that appeared, it was criticized in a manner that seems to have stopped activity regarding it. So we didn't even have an errata sheet for Vol. II. I don't know whether the number of errata even for Volume I would be sufficient so that we could say that the major mistakes have all been pointed out; but it would surely be well worth while to draw up a list of them and this could easily be done.

Chao I wonder whether we have in view some sort of a student's aid, with errata and other things, so that a student can use that and then use the KTHY directly or whether we envisage some more ambitious project, which would somehow further process the KTHY.

Mote That belongs properly to the second phase of our discussion, to which I'll now proceed if nobody has anything further to say about the book itself. Are there any further comments on it? Professor Stimson described KTHY as "an elegant textbook". Does anybody disagree, perhaps considering it an inelegant textbook?

Stimson I will say that, after lugging it around, I'm prepared to revise that a little. It's heavy.

Mote Well, if you buy the newspaper edition, which costs $7.50, that's somewhat lighter.

If that's all about the book itself, I'll point us in the direction Dr. Chao has just indicated, by making a summary statement.

I should like to point that there are two kinds of persons around this table: There are linguistis, who are producers or generators of linguistic knowledge; and there are consumers, who simply demand a better product -- the category I fall into. My interest is simply that of the teacher, who is constantly looking for a better product to use; and I don't want to pretend to be a linguist or a producer, or someone who is going to generate the linguistic knowledge that will lead to these better products. The approach I am suggesting here is thus a practical one. The remarks I am going to make are not entirely my own, but rather a summary of the opinions which have appeared through the practical use of teaching material here at Princeton and in other places.

As consumers, we are constantly trying to stimulate more supplementary teaching materials and more approaches to the presentation of Chinese language. We were delighted when Mrs. Pian's A Syllabus for Mandarin Primer appeared a few years ago. We have encouraged Prof. T. T. Ch'en to draw up materials he was preparing for first and second year levels as he has recently done in Tarn Butyng, a book of readings which will appear as Item 1 in the Linguistics Project searies of teaching materials. Under Prof. Ch'en's direction, also, Mrs. T'ang of the Project staff has prepared another teaching aid, a compendium of all the particles which appear in the Fifty Stories volume, arranged under analytical headings to show their grammatical use. We have used the Fifty Stories, and will probably continue to do so, as a transitional text for the point when a student leaves his second year of Modern Chinese and begins study of classical Chinese in the third year. Our drill instructors demand more pattern drill sentence materials and we are trying to encourage compilation of this kind of material also.

The point is that we would like to achieve some day a large body of classroom materials which will adopt a consistent approach throughout, which will stress spoken Chinese as the medium of learning of all kinds of Chinese at all levels, and which will have consistent explanations of grammar and structure. This would be a coherent body of materials, and a cumulative one, in the sense that each part builds on the last and isn't unnecessarily repetitious. When it comes to classical or literary Chinese, or whatever name we give it, this too, we think, should be taught as a living language, or at least as an active extension of the language in the minds of living Chinese; and we think its study should begin after a considerable foundation in modern spoken Chinese so that classical Chinese can be taught in a bi-lingual situation. By "bi-lingual" here, I mean that classical Chinese is the subject of study and modern spoken Chinese is the medium through which it is studied, the other language to which fundamental analogies are constructed. The third language, then, would be English. It would be all right to use it minimally, though precise translation is also a discipline that should emerge from this course of study.

In our scheme of things, we begin classical Chinese in the third year, and it can either be taught simultaneously with continuation of the modern spoken Chinese or, if the student chooses, he can switch to the classical Chinese track at this point and do no more with spoken Chinese, except that he'll have to use it in classroom situations, as I have indicated.

The reason for doing this is perhaps a controversial one. At any rate, Chinese is not normally taught that way. I don't know how many of you do in your own institutions. I would like to call your attention to Chang K'un's review of the Fifty Stories which appeared in the Journal of Asian Studies in 1961. Please allow me to quote a passage of Prof. Chang's review: "One important remark on the use of this book also deserves our attention. The student should read out repeatedly the whole of the classical text as a preparation for the assimilation of the text. The assimilation consists in committing to memory not only the pronunciation and the meaning of the isolated characters, but in attempting to retain at the same time a clear recollection of the contexts in which they occur. By making a determined and prolonged effort to assimilate whole lessons in this way, the student will greatly intensify the reading experience which he can gain from the study of the story. It may be well for him to remember that his ability to deal with untranslated passages will depend almost exclusively on the reading experience which he will eventually have accumulated." That approach seems consistent with the way we try to teach the first two years of Modern Spoken Chinese. It is that consistency of approach which we would like to retain in going on to classical Chinese.

Beyond the Fifty Stories, there hasn't been any extensive or comprehensive body of materials in classical Chinese with modern Chinese paraphernalia which could form the basis for a full sequence of courses. That is, there hadn't been until Wang Li's text appeared. Its virtue in our eyes is that it gives us now a textbook designed by a well trained leading linguist, a man whom many specialists in Chinese studies have helped as he compiled the work, by contributing the insights derived from their experience as classroom teachers. This does for the contemporary student in a Chinese university about what we would like to do for his counterpart in our universities. I think when you see the level of annotation in this you will be dismayed, on the one hand, that it is now necessary to tell a Chinese college student so many of the things which this book has to tell him; but at the same time, it is helpful to us because it means that the situation of the Chinese student of university level now is more analogous to that of our students than it would have been 20 years ago. It still isn't completely analogous. There are many ways in which this book usefully serves the needs of a Chinese student but isn't adequate for ours. And yet, the levels of the two are drawing much closer together. That a group of scholars of the capacities of Wang Li and his associates would, at this point in history, devote themselves to this problem means that Chinese expertise has now been focused on a level of problems useful to us, in a way that has not been true in the past.

The impact of the book in China, then, was very great. Within the first year Volume I was printed and reprinted in 150,000 or more copies, as the publication data in them shows. The two parts of Vol. II were printed, but in more restricted fashion for reasons that we have hinted at earlier; but they did have an impact in China. I think we can now look to this book as providing the basis of courses that will solve many long-standing problems for us. It is for this reason that we have encouraged reprinting with the help I have spoken of; and we predict that it may well become a basic tool in Japan and in the West.

Looking forward to that, we would like to propose a manual, a tool book to use with KTHY, which will make its use more convenient and more consistent in our universities. There are many problems with it. Its reading selections, as Prof. Yang has pointed out, are often too brief. In the case of the Analects and the Shih Chi, for example, there isn't enough to enable the students to gain an awareness of the style of Chinese represented by these books. In the case of the Mencius, the selections are unbalanced for obvious ideological reasons. I do think that Mencius is a very important teaching text and that this portion of the KTHY should be vastly expanded for practical use in classrooms here.

Therefore, we are not simply suggesting that this book should be adopted as it is but rather that, if its best features can be retained, it can provide a core around which a consistent sequence of courses could be established. It has so many linguistic and pedagogical points of excellence, and they offer so much convenience, that we think it merits the preparation of a handbook to facilitate its use. Our purposes, then, would be to take advantage of its coherent, internally well-integrated approach to the problem of language and to the succession of styles it presents; and to build on that by using elements of it as a core providing four successive terms of classical Chinese, a two-year sequence. These courses should be designed so as to permit considerable flexibility by using further portions of the KTHY, or preferably by expanding the reading selections in certain sections (for example, more Mencius, more Shih Chi, more T'ang and Sung essays).

At the same time, we hope to utilize the supplementary materials, the introductions to aspects of Chinese civilization in the "T'ung Lun" 通論, which has been in part reprinted by Lung Men Bookstore in a separate volume called Chung-kuo wen-hua ch'ang-shih 中國文化常識. [This reprinting is unfortunately not complete.] I think we can fruitfully use the portions which appear in the various "T'ung Lun" chapters as excellent essays in modern Chinese on these background subjects, to supplement KTHY's discussions of vocabulary and usage, and similarly we can use all the appended apparatus on prosody and the like. These enrich the student's body of cultural information rather consistently and coherently, whereas otherwise this kind of information tends to be dealt with piecemeal in footnotes, never getting the coherent statement that will most aid the student. Thus we will avoid the piecemeal footnoting on those subjects which would be needed if we simply prepared random texts for student's use.

On the basis of experience in the classroom here, the following proposal has been made about the precise use of the book: We propose still to use the Fifty Stories, or at least part of it, as the bridge to classical Chinese for a period of weeks at the beginning of the first wenyan semester. Then, as Prof. Yang has pointed out, the KTHY chronological arrangement of Chinese texts is not necessarily the best one. Even though in the main we want to preserve a sense of how the styles developed chronologically, we can do some skipping back and forth. In our experience, the Tso Chuan and Chan-Kuo Ts'e are too difficult for a student to begin with. He may come back to these after a period of training in classical Chinese. He may well find, if he wants to take up those styles, that the KTHY selections would still be the ideal introduction to them. But for his beginning, in his first semester of classical Chinese, we would use the Analects and the Mencius as prose materials and the Shih Ching section (KTHY sixth unit) as a kind of balancing item in the realm of poetry. In each semester we intend to combine a major focus on prose styles of the period with a minor one on the poetry, so that both are systematically introduced.

The second term we will focus on the Shih Chi, which would have to be greatly supplemented. The selection from the Shih Chi in KTHY is excellent, but it is simply not enough. The Han Shu (Unit 8) selections might well be added to that, or others from KTHY, Unit 9 (Han prose). Thus, the second term would probably use Units 8 and 9 plus Unit 13 on Ku-shih, ancient poetry.

The third semester would stress T'ang and Sung prose as the main item, perhaps two-thirds of the time (that is, Unit 10); and one third of the time would be the supplementary Unit 13, on T'ang and Sung Poetry.

The fourth term would utilize Units 11 and 12 on parallel prose and rhymed prose, p'ien-wen and fu, supplemented by the two parts of Unit 14 on tz'u and ch'ü, for poetry.

To review the contents of the book in order, then, Unit 1 on the Tso Chuan and Unit 2 on the Chan-kuo Ts'e are considered too difficult to be incorporated in the sequence but, as I said, having these two units could still be valuable to students, who can later on (and perhaps even through self-study) use them as introductions to those styles. Unit 3 on the Lun Yü is a good selection and includes a little bit of the Li Chi, which might be used, though we feel that expanding the Lun Yü section would be more useful. Unit 4 on the Mencius is a biased selection of materials but well presented; and if you simply added to this by balancing it with the full range of Mencian thought, you would have an excellent body of material. Unit 5 is on the pre-Ch'in philosophers -- Prof. Yang objects that these are quite often too short -- and yet they are representative selections perhaps and quite interesting to the students. Unit 6 on the Shih Ching is regarded as a good selection. But Unit 7 on the Ch'u Tz'u, although a good selection, is in our opinion too difficult to be included in the central course. Unit 8 on the Shih Chi and Han Shu contains too few entries in any case. There is always some question of just which chapters of the Shih Chi to use; everyone has his favorites. But we would in any case plan to expand that considerably. For Unit 9 on Han and Six Dynasties prose, the selections are good, but whether they are too advanced or too difficult to use extensively is something we will try to prove through further exposure. Unit 10 on T'ang and Sung prose is very useful; we give it a very high rating for utility. Unit 11 on Six Synasties and T'ang parallel prose is also excellent. Unit 12 on rhymed prose from

寡人之於國也（梁惠王上）(1)

梁惠王曰："寡人(a)之於國也，盡心焉耳矣(2)：河內凶(3)，則移其民於河東(4)，移其粟(b)於河內；河東凶亦然(5)。察鄰國之政(6)，無如寡人之用心(c)者。鄰國之民不加少，寡人之民不加多(7)，何也？"

GOAREN JY YU GWO YEE

MENQTZYY: LIANG HUEYWANG Shanq

Liang Hueywang iue: "Goaren jy yu gwo yee, jinn shin ian eel yii: Her ney shiong, tzer yi chyi min yu Her dong, yi chyi suh yu Her ney; Her dong shiong yih ran. Char lingwo jy jenq, wu ru goaren jy yonq shin jee. Lingwo jy min bu jia shao, goaren jy min bu jia duo, her yee?"

【譯文】 梁惠王〔對孟子〕說："我對於國家，眞是費盡心力了。河內地方如果遭了飢荒，我便把那裏的一部分百姓遷移到河東，同時還把河東的一部分糧食運到河內。假如河東遭了飢荒也是這樣辦的。我曾經考察過鄰國的政治，沒有一個國家能像我這樣替百姓打算的。可是，那些國家的百姓並不因此減少，我的百姓並不因此加多，這是什麼緣故呢？"

(1) 孟子在這裏指出了梁惠王所用的"愛民"臨時措施，與鄰國之政實際上是五十步與百步之比，他認爲治國的根本之道是實行"仁政"。梁惠王，即魏惠王（魏是國名），姓魏名罃，因魏都大梁，故又稱梁惠王。"惠"是諡號。"梁惠王"是《孟子》的一篇，後面的"公孫丑"等同。

措施 tsuohshy 為達到一個目的或應付一件事情所採取的行動 Measure (a course of action)

諡號 shyhhaw 君主大臣或有功德的人死後所得的稱號 Posthumous title

(a) 寡人 寡德之人，德行不多的人 -- 君主謙虛 (chianshiu 客氣) 的自稱

(2) 耳矣，等於說"已矣"，"耳"和"矣"都是句尾語氣詞，連用等於說"啦"。"盡心焉耳矣"，大意是："〔總算〕盡了心啦。" 句尾語氣詞 Final particle of a sentence

(3) 河內，指黃河北岸，今河南沁縣一帶。凶，荒年。

荒年 huangnian 因為天災或者人禍而收成不好，糧食不夠吃的年頭兒，也叫凶年

(4) 河東，黃河以東，今山西西南部。

(b) 粟 一種穀類，現代叫小米 這裏是指所有穀類或糧食說的

(5) 亦然，也是這樣。

(6) 察，觀察。

(c) 用心 和"盡心"的意思一樣

(7) 加，更。以上幾句說明了戰國時人民生活痛苦，渴望較安定的生活。同時勞動力的缺乏迫使有些統治者對人民做些讓步以便"奪民"。

King Hûi of Liang said, 'Small as my virtue is, in the government of my kingdom, I do indeed exert my mind to the utmost. If the year be bad on the inside of the river, I remove *as many of* the people *as I can* to the east of the river, and convey grain to the country in the inside. When the year is bad on the east of the river, I act on the same plan. On examining the government of the neighbouring kingdoms, I do not find that there is any prince who exerts his mind as I do. And yet the people of the neighbouring kingdoms do not decrease, nor do my people increase. How is this?'

Han through Sung fu is also excellent. Unit 13 on poetry from Han to Sung is interesting but perhaps neither so balanced nor so large a selection as our teachers would like to have. Considerable supplementing would have to be done. However, the supporting paraphernalia here, on prosody, is so useful that we think the KTHY should be the doorway through which this field should be entered. The same is also true for Unit 14 on Sung Tz'u and Yüan Ch'ü.

How would we build the course, then? What would we try to accomplish in a handbook for teaching purposes? We have experimented quite a bit with this. We have set up some models; we have sample lessons here which we will distribute to you. We pass these out with some trepidation. They are so emergent and tentative that we don't want them taken away or circulated generally, but simply want to use them as examples and as starting points for discussion. As for the sheet on the shiutzyh (particles), this is a sample of something we will be printing up fairly soon. If any of you want copies, we will be glad to send them to you.

Let's look at the Xerox copies of the workbook sample [Herewith]. Obviously the format of the sample lessons could be improved and, if actually printed, it could be reduced considerably, so that much more could be put on a page. The selection from KTHY appears at the top on the left. This is the object of study; and all the other materials appearing here are simply tools for the student. We follow the format established in the Mandarin Primer and accept the notion that it is unproductive for the students to spend classroom time indicating to the teacher that they have figured out the meaning of a passage. In other words, we think decoding, deciphering, or reciting in the classroom word-by-word solutions to the basic problem of translation is unproductive. Therefore, we try to solve those simple problems for the student without wasting his time. We give him the romanization of the complete text immediately so that he can read it and hear it with ease and fluency, and can begin that process of assimilation which Professor Chang K'un mentioned in his review of the Fifty Stories. We would stress memorization in many cases and in all cases encourage reading to the point of great familiarity with the passage.

Then we present two other study tools. First, the bairhuah translation (in this case, the translation prepared by the Committee for Translating and Annotating of the Mencius set up at Lanchow University, a very impressive item of scholarship). Where a good bairhuah translation exists, we will use it. If it doesn't exist, we will provide it, though we could seldom provide one of this quality.

On the bottom of the right hand page, there is an English version. Here we have simply given you the Legge translation. We think it important for the student to know about Legge, though there are inconsistencies between the Legge and the bairhuah version. But if both are seen as tools for the study of the original material, such discrepancies, which are going to be a fact of life for the students' experience of Chinese texts anyway, might as well be frankly introduced at this point. We won't necessarily limit ourselves to Legge. We would like to use examples of all the monuments of modern scholarship in presenting English or modern Western-language renderings: Couvreur, for example, or others. In this way we could give the students a knowledge of the state of the field, of the sinological tradition that has accumulated in the West.

Then there is a body of notes, some of which are Wang Li's, but with these supplemented by other notes which seem peculiarly necessary for the Western student. Thus, for this very small selection of Mencius, we have two full pages of supporting material.

I'm not suggesting that we have solved all the problems. We have really only begun to look at them, in fact. And I'm not sure that this format is the best possible; indeed, it could certainly be improved. If we produced a handbook for the portions of the KTHY I've touched on, we could almost abandon KTHY; but we wouldn't come to that. We wouldn't prepare all of the KTHY in this fashion. We would simply prepare certain materials which would be the core around which a semester's course would be built, and expect to use the remainder of the KTHY, plus other materials, freely beyond that point. We might well suggest a list of further readings in the *Mencius* or the *Shih Chi* and even process some of those in this same manner. But we wouldn't expect to control all the texts completely, because we think maximum flexibility and freedom on the design of courses should be retained.

For the "*T'ung Lun*", the very valuable section of the KTHY which gives background information on periods and on problems, we have experimented with the idea of translating these for distribution to the students in order to encourage them to read these also. Whether we will translate them in full, we don't yet know. If we did, the idea would be that, if the student wants to talk about these subjects in modern Chinese he shouldn't have to begin by simply solving the problem of meaning -- he should have more assistance in getting into it, so that classroom discussion of these problems conducted entirely in Chinese will be easier for him. Rather than having classroom activities reduced to the level of simply decoding those, he starts off at a higher level immediately, and higher demands can be placed upon him. He finds the course more stimulating intellectually than simply proving that, yes, he can figure out this or that sentence.

(COFFEE BREAK)

In this folder we have, in one copy only, other portions of the *Mencius*, including a section that does not appear in KTHY but which has been prepared as an example of a further selection from *Mencius*, and with a slightly different format. Anyone who is interested in seeing this may have a look at it. Several people have asked whether those who have actually used the KTHY for teaching shouldn't say a few words about their experience. As far as I know, Prof. Malmqvist, Prof. Kao and Prof. Ruhlmann have used it.

Malmqvist I haven't really used it extensively in teaching as yet. I wonder, however, which book would be simpler for the student to use. I am speaking now of the very ambitious anthologies called *Hsien-ch'in wen-hsüeh-shih ts'an-k'ao tzu-liao* 先秦文學史参考資料 and *Liang-Han wen-hsüeh-shih ts'an-k'ao tzu-liao* 兩漢文學史参考資料 which have a completely different objective from the KTHY. They have very extensive annotation and the editors discuss each point very fully. They give five or six varying interpretations of each difficult passage, and so on. I feel myself that the clever student would benefit more greatly from Hsien-ch'in wen-hsüeh-shih ts'an-k'ao tzu-liao than from KTHY. And from the teacher's point of view, I think again it might be easier to teach from the fuller treatment. I have the feeling that when Wang Li actually wrote KTHY, he wanted to do something that was a good deal simpler and less complicated than the Hsien-ch'in wen-hsüeh-shih ts'an-k'ao tzu-liao.

Mote Do you suggest that such works might be used as a supplement for KTHY where you want more extensive exposure to a particular author?

Malmqvist I should think so. One could use passages from KTHY but which could also be found in the other and I would at the same time refer the student to both.

Mote That is an interesting point, a useful bit of advice.

Kao For good students I think such more scholarly anthologies may be better, but for average students in their first year classical Chinese the reference material in them is a bit too difficult: The footnotes are very extensive and most of them are not really for explanation but rather for historical background.

McCoy I am curious whether any statement could be given on how much of a student's time was spent on the classical text as opposed to the bairhuah notes. The one qualm I have here is that we might end up with the student spending maybe two-thirds of his time doing translation exercises in the bairhuah notes instead of working on wenyan, which is what the course is supposed to be. The notes are in effect made for the person who had the good fortune to be a native speaker and has probably had eight or ten years of bairhuah. So the notes are no problem at all to him and completely helpful; but for the rest of us it would be a two-stage exercise, first translating the notes to get at the classical Chinese. At the end of two years in the courses most of us give, how much time does the average student spend on the notes, as opposed to the classical text? Can any of those who have worked with this text answer that?

Kao One of the reasons why I prefer KTHY to Hsien-Ch'in wen-hsüeh shih tzu-liao is that the notes are extremely easy. I think the studens don't have to spend any large amount of time on the notes, which usually start with a very simple summary explanation at the beginning, leaving the historical background to the end, so that of course it can be omitted if you want. For instance, here is yaw, juuyaw de dawlii 要，主要的道理 (Yaw, 'the chief reason'). I think students like this kind of explanation. It also offers good practise for later use of Chinese dictionaries.

Mote I feel that there is some general sentiment of doubt regarding the practicality of using modern spoken Chinese as the means of instruction. Of course one must establish this as a normal and natural affair, not an artificial exercise in which one engages only through pressure. The students will do it naturally if you do it too.

Wrenn A couple of the comments seem related to the use of analogous texts set up in a similar way. For example, Meng-tzu Shih-i 孟子釋義, which we have been using for a couple of years and with some techniques which I think are very similar, relying really on a sequence of events.

If you begin by reading an English translation, so that you know generally what the content is -- and there are excellent reasons for using Legge and, where other translations are available, some of those as well -- then read the bairhuah notes, and at the same time look over the text, a lot of that comes through pretty quickly with a little bit of work. If a textbook or a dictionary is also written quite simply, the students can understand a very substantial portion very rapidly. The basic problem is to explicate the original text and to point out the discrepancies that exist sometimes between the two different styles of writing. It is a problem in the beginning -- it takes a month, or perhaps two months -- for the students to understand the complementary role these two styles play, working one with the other. After a while, however, by the end of a semester and certainly if they have worked on material like this for more than that, they don't really feel there is a problem. They read things and absorb them, and go on. But it does take a while, perhaps a month of disjunction while they establish internally the style-mix for the bairhuah explication and the original text.

Chao I think there's room for flexibility in the program of teaching, depending upon the teachers and the institution where the program takes place. It is useful to have the bairhuah equivalent in the handbook. I suppose most of you know that I lean more towards having the bairhuah well established in the students' heads before they go on to wenyan. On the other hand, I have actually had the experience of teaching starting Chinese with wenyan exclusively, using it as if it were a living language, supplemented a good deal by the audio-lingual approach, but without any recourse to bairhuah. In that case, of course, the additional study of bairhuah could be an additional burden.

Malmqvist I am just looking at the passage goaren jy yu gwo yee 寡人之於國也. It occurs to me that it may be somewhat dangerous simply to hand the students Wang Li's explanations of certain terms without indicating that other interpretations are actually possible. I'm referring to Professor Yang's point, that things have been done in Western scholarship over the last 30 or 40 years.

If you look at point 2 on page 3, under (a), on eel yii, deengyu shuo yii yii 耳矣，等於說已矣. It would be preferable here to supplement Wang Li's explanation (eel yii is the same as saying yii yii) by stating that eel" 耳 " is a fusion form of erl yii 而矣 , and then you can refer to the articles discussing this. You have Kennedy and Graham and others. If this is the first given instance of a fusion word, you could have a little essay on the concept of fusion words, and also on the particular instances of fusion words. You could even go further and put all the fusion words in KTHY in one section.

Then if you look at the first line jinn-shin yan eel yii 盡心焉耳矣 (焉 , incidentally, should be pronounced in the second tone, not the first as given in the sample workbook) and compare Legge's translation: "I do indeed exert my mind to the utmost." You can see that Legge has missed the point of yan. He wrote before Kennedy, of course. (Laughter) I think it would be useful here to refer to the differing functions of yen^2 and of yen^1, and also to the polemics between Mullie and Kennedy on this point. What I mean is, I think it is dangerous to present Wang Li's notes here on a page for the students with the idea that this is the final truth. You must give full references, so that good students can go to Kennedy and Graham and so on, and make up their own minds.

Mote This is an excellent idea. We weren't sure whether to do that sort of thing as footnotes, as these problems occur, or whether they should be in an introductory compendium of some kind. You are quite right, it is our responsibility to make the student aware of the present level of scholarship on problems of this kind. We will have to solve that, one way or another.

Kratochvil I think there may be a more general problem involved here, if I may comment on something which is completely out of my range. I am referring to the general way that grammar -- general grammatical categories, perhaps -- are treated in Wang Li's textook. First, it is true that classical Chinese grammar is presented more or less in terms of modern standard Chinese -- not only in terms of the medium of modern Chinese, but also in terms of one particular interpretation of modern Chinese. I am referring now to the traditon that has developed on the mainland, particularly after the Stalin denunciation of Marr. There have been a number of books which have created this tradition -- an example would be Lü Shu-hsiang's and Chu Te-hsi's Yü-fa hsiu-tz'u chiang-hua 語法虛詞講話. The same sort of thing is carried over into more popular books and into materials designed for teaching grammar at the secondary level.

The point is that a certain tradition of handling Chinese grammar or conceiving Chinese grammar has developed in the Mainland, and in my opinion the way the grammar of classical Chinese is presented in Wang Li is a direct reflection of it. I am not trying to evaluate here; but, there is a comparable tradition which has been developing over the past twenty years or so of looking at modern Chinese grammar in the West, particularly in the United States, which is in certain respects quite different from this tradition.

The problem arises that the same terminology is sometimes used for slightly diverging categories. To put it bluntly, when Wang Li uses the term donqtsyr, he doesn't necessarily mean exactly the same thing that we mean when we say "verb" or "verbal expression" in referring to modern Chinese. If we want to compare the traditions on the same ground, I think we can compare, let's say, the books produced in China on modern Chinese grammar in the early fifties with the translation of the Mandarin Primer -- I don't know whether authorized or unauthorized -- which was published by

Li Jung under the title of Pei-ching K'ou-yü yü-fa.* We can than see exactly how completely different these worlds are. I don't known to what degree this creates a danger: I think if we look at the xerox copies here, we will see that the terms are simply translated and no consideration is given to the possibility that there may be diverging traditions, diverging conventions, diverging undertanding on the level of categories. It all gets overlapped in the term. Now I wonder whether this offers any problems at all.

Chao Would a glossary comparing recent usages be helpful in this regard?

Malmqvist There are at least two fairly recently published grammars of classical Chinese on the Mainland, done by Liang Po-chün and Liu Ching-wen. I've forgotten the titles, but one is Wen-yen Yü-fa, the other I think Ku Han-yü yü-fa. Both are based on the Bloomfieldian tradition: and one finds there the same sort of grammatical terminology as that in Li Jung's translation of Prof. Chao's Introduction to the Mandarin Primer. It would be extremely worthwhile if either or, since there are significant differences, prererably both could be translated into English. They aren't very extensive, the sort of thing that would perhaps take a scholar the best part of a year to do; but it would be something worth considering. I'm sure there is nothing like it in the West, no grammar of classical Chinese that even approaches the competence of these.

Mote Are you suggesting that, say, this Project undertake such a translation?

Malmqvist Yes, I think it would be very useful.

Chao I was just thinking that a good preliminary step would be to make a glossary for different usages between Mainland writers and scholars in the West dealing with both classical and modern Chinese grammar.

Mote What about a full-scale translation of Liang Po-chün and Liu Ching-wen?

Chao Well, of course that would contain observations on the differences. I don't know how much of a job it would be.

Malmqvist Over 200 pages.

Kao Even if we could just translate the grammar part of Wang Li's T'ung-lun and give to the students for reference, things like the note on dongtsyr, it would be a great help.

Wrenn Al Gleason at the Hartford Seminary Foundation has been working for the past couple of years on a dictionary of linguistic terms, which is a beautiful model for solution of just this kind of problem. It presents all the various usages by a number of different authors for particular terms, nicely cross-referenced and with certain in-vocabulary checks -- e. g., to make sure that any word that is used in a definiton is actually defined somewhere in the text -- and with a review of articles on comparative usages citing the various authors involved. However, it hasn't yet actually been done for certain of the terminology in Chinese linguistics.

---

* It was so unauthorized that they did not even put Dr. Chao's name on the book as author.

A second point that is related not so much to this as to Prof. Malmqvist's earlier comment: The problem of using poor citations. Two or three years ago, we tried using Dobson's *Late Archaic Chinese* as a focus for the Mencius, as a text and guide. We found it absolutely impossible, just too confusing to the students; but we did compile just this kind of annotated list of citations, submitted it to the students and left it in the library for them to refer to. We found it worked out better if they read the article before they went on to the selections. If they knew, for example, that *ian*/*yan* is going to turn up, they they could go over the two sections on *ian*/*yan* before reading the text. If they know the two particles enough beforehand, then there could also be a little discussion in class.

Ruhlmann I agree with Prof. Malmqvist that those two important Chinese grammatical books should be translated into English. Since it's going to take some time, I would like to suggest a first step which could be done in a shorter time: That forty pages, more or less, of grammatical introduction to the structure of *wenyan* could be compiled out of Wang Li's grammatical notes. If this were put in the students' hands before we start working with them on texts, it could furnish a helpful introduction. It shouldn't be too hard, in each of the chapters and paragraphs of this forty pages, to mention the differences in terminology between current usage in the US and that elsewhere. This is a point on which we should seek to help the student beforehand. Such an aid could be as useful as Prof. Chao's Introduction to the *Mandarin Primer* is for *bairhuah*.

Ellegiers When I look through the work-sheets presented here, I find the way it is set forth extremely interesting. But, if they are for use by students, I just wonder whether the comments given here for a formula like that in the first sentence *jy yu* ... *yee* 之於 ...也 is really easy to understand. Wouldn't it be necessary to hint, to explain this grammatical formula to a student, to tell him that such kinds of introductory clauses have three possible constructions, and eventually to give references to works where he can find these explanations?

Then, always considering grammatical difficulties, I don't see any explanation of the particle *tzer* 則 , which introduces the principal clauses in the second sentence. Also the reason, for example, why Legge translates *ran* 然 in its causative meaning.

Also there are grammatical difficulties in such constructions as *wu ru goaren jy yong-shin jee* 無如寡人之用心者: The formula *wu* ... *jee* ... , and then why *jee* is used to indicate an object clause following *ru*. I think students will ask why *jee* can be used in this way.

Mote I agree with you that the compiler of this material must have a system of Chinese grammatical structure in his mind. The teacher in the classroom must have something to refer to. But should grammar then be extracted out and taught systematically, as a study in itself, or should it be taught through the student's acquiring it inductively from exposure to the materials themselves? Both are done. There are undoubtedly things to be said in favor of both methods. But, for a workbook of this kind, which do you think is the more appropriate means of solving this problem?

Wrenn

Very often textbooks have in the second half parts of the text itself used as examples, and this provides a form for introducing each of these characters with an explanation, not so much of the grammar as of their meaning in particular passages, together with each of the separate meanings. This *jee* is explained there. Similarly, the definition of the term *goaren* is taken out of the *Meng-tzu tzu-tien* section in the back.

Malmqvist

If you were to teach classical grammar solely in relation to the text read, the student would have to read a great many selections before all the grammatical points occurring even in this first sentence here would be covered fully. I think it would be a lot easier to start with a concept of a sentence, and to discuss such matters as sentence suffixes and clause subordination before you really get into the text. Having done this, the student could proceed much faster.

Yang

Just give the students sheer basic usages of the particles and basic construction, like(*bu woo jy*) 不 我 知 . I think this wouldn't take more than three weeks.

Mote

I am not sure whether the people who teach the *Fifty Stories* as a bridge find that it serves this purpose satisfactorily or not. We are not sure ourselves that we will retain the *Fifty Stories* always, but we've hitherto used it for that.

Yang

I have four or five pages of notes, using examples only from the *Analects* and *Mencius*. Then by going through the selections of *Mencius*, with some additional remarks, the students should be able to grasp the general idea. Later on you can give them more advanced things, but start with the basics.

Ch'en, T.T.

After two years of *bairhuah* we immediately begin *wenyan* texts, using the *Fifty Stories* romanized text and *bairhuah* translations, so this isn't too much of a plunge. In a very short period, say four weeks, we finish the *Fifty Stories* and then switch to KTHY. By the time the student has finished the *Fifty Stories* he knows all the basic particles. When later on these are discussed systematically in the KTHY, in the light of what they already know, the students will regard it only as a kind of review.

Mei

I think there are actually two questions here: One is how to give enough grammar to the student so that he can operate with *wenyan*, and the other is how to set before him a clearly, critically and linguistically adequate grammar of classical Chinese. These two questions are on different levels of difficulty.

In regard to Prof. Ruhlmann's suggestion of providing a 40-page introduction, I think if one just reads Chou Fa-kao's attempt to set up form-classes, or Kennedy's abortive attempt at a Mencius grammar, or indeed *Late Archaic Chinese*, then we realized how difficult it is even to make the first beginning of a form-class, not to speak of larger units. It therefore seems to me that quite a few years will pass before we know enough about Chinese grammar to write that 40 pages. I remember that in Dr. Chao's Preface to the *Mandarin Primer*, he notes that Li Fang-kuei's comment made him postpone his deadline.

I was also thinking about the possibility of just making a glossary of terms used in the Mainland and those used in America. It seems to me that the difficulty is not only terminological differences but also differences due to the conceptical framework. That is, I think in the Mainland there is a continuing tradition of using both structural and semantic criteria together, whereas in the post-Bloomfieldian period American linguists have been trying to get away from semantic definitions. For example, in this Wang Li text, it says: "矣"是一個表示動態的語氣詞, 它意味着事物的變化和發展 [Yii is a particle expressing change of state, indicating the change or development of a thing.] This, to me, is pretty semantic. Offhand, I would say that yii is in complementary distribution with wey, so that both of them have some sort of completed-or-not-completed aspect; and I would thus go about it structurally.

It seems to me that it is not simply a matter of terminological disequivalence between American and Mainland China. That does not really tell the students what the problem is.

Such a glossary as had been suggested would indeed help the first question (the practical problem of giving the student enough to help him operate with wenyan) but it would certainly fall a long way short of teaching him to understand why these terms are used. Eventually, I think, the student will have to be his own grammarian; and, unless he knows within what framework these people are operating, he will not be able to do so. The problem will of course get a good deal more complicated yet when we have a transformational grammar of classical Chinese.

Kratochvil I very much agree. This is just what I tried to say. In the problem of content versus form, and the categories set up by the Mainland linguists, which are of course mainly based upon the Marxist dialectical theory of how content and form are interrelated, and the contradictions and all such trimmings -- of course everything is defined in terms of meaning and form and they are in a certain relationship -- all this is reflected in Wang Li's definitions very beautifully. Read the whole passage beginning on page 313 of Vol. I on word-classes and what follows. All this apparatus is reflected in practically every sentence.

The problem is not just one of correlating terminology. I think in the long run it would be necessary to reformulate everything in the textbook in terms of a more formal approach. This is not because Wang Li's approach is better or worse than another. The main thing is that, in the whole course of his study the student, particularly in his approach to modern Chinese, has been brought up on categories of the more formal post-Bloomfieldian nature. These categories are reflected in practically all the textbooks available to him. Without any warning, he then has to switch, still using terminology which very often overlaps, to categories which are conceived in a completely different way. He gets no warning of this. He is just given a note like: "Daytsyr 代詞 is a substitutive pronoun." What can he make out of this if he is not a trained linguist?

(Miss Liu asked about Prof. Shadick's book on the grammar of classical Chinese; and Dr. Bodman answered that it is to appear soon, though it cannot be said how soon.)

Rickett I am not a linguist, but I have had the fortune of teaching this stuff for several years. As a teacher I have found that there are really three problems involved: there is the linguistic problem, which I think is covered to a large extent in this text; there is also the cultural problem, which I think is even more important than the linguistic problem in trying to impart enough about it to handle classical Chinese; and, above and beyond that, there is the psychological problem, the problem of the student who comes in and looks at a page of Chinese, of which he can recognize practically every character but it's absolutely meaningless to him. He doesn't know where a sentence begins or ends because there is no punctuation. There are simply notes, which are written in a technical jargon he can't understand and which has nothing to do with bairhuah notes; but this is what the student has to cope with. He is not going to cope with something that is beautifully punctuated for him, has beautiful bairhuah notes, and so on. This is why I have grave questions about the kind of appraoch given here in the workbook.

When I started out this summer teaching a course at Stanford with Fifty Chinese Stories, I was very grateful for the bairhuah translation because it made the class run smoothly. But as soon as we got off that material and got to the point where the student had no crutch, I found that he was not psychologically prepared to deal with unprocessed materials. Furthermore, I found that the bairhuah translation in Fifty Chinese Stories is often misleading to the student because it covers up a tremendous number of problems that exist in the text. And in that particular text, there are very few notes which help bring out this important fact.

Let us say this: Generally we have a student, say, for three years of classical training before he goes off to Taiwan, and is pretty much on his own. Assuming that he has already had two or three years of bairhuah before he took classical Chinese training, if he spends two years on what in many ways is pablum, what chance has he in one year of developing the kind of psychological attitudes that will give him the independence to approach a task, figure it out for himself, and then in class discuss the various frames of possibility?

What I have had to say has been rather on the negative side. But I also find that there is a tremendous amount in this material which I feel is very valuable: The discussions in the bairhuah and the notes, the cultural materials added, are examples. My problem then is: Is there a way in which we can cover essentially the same range of materials, to give to the student an experience of different types of material (such as you've outlined for your two-year program), while at the same time also giving him the opportunity to seek on his own and to come to grip with texts, with the type of material with which he will have to struggle when doing his own research; so that he does not develop a habit of relying upon translations into either bairhuah or English; so that he develops a kind of flexibility of mind that lets him look at a sentence and -- when he finds he has boxed himself in, that this translation really doesn't work -- enables him to go back and start over again. These are some of the things that concern me, since we only have three years to deal with. While this program I think is effective in adding such things as grammatical notes and so on -- it deals with the linguistic aspect very well and also the cultural aspect -- it is only the psychological aspect that I don't feel has been handled too well.

Chao About the psychological aspect, I think something similar occurred even among Chinese Children, when they went to school in the old days and studied nothing but the classics. The teachers explained everthing in bairhuah, but after a while they had to be on their own. Of course, though, they had more years to study Chinese than Western students, who want to get somewhere in three or four years.

There is one thing which could be of help. For example, here the original goaren jy yu gwo yee 寡人之於國也 is translated as woo dueyyu gwojia 我對於國家 (I with respect to my country); and jinnshin ian erlyii 盡心焉而矣 is given as jen.shyh fey .jinn. shinlih.le 真是費盡心力了. But if you translate it structurally, perhaps you could start something like Woodih duey.yu gwo ah 我的對於國啊, (actually translating yee as ah), yonqjinn.le shin tzay lii.tour jiowshyh.le 用盡了心在裡頭就是了 (...have simply exhausted my mind within). (Laughter) This is more structural, you see.* I have been doing this to some extent, whenever desirable in my forthcoming Grammar. When it seems useful I give this sort of translation, even though it may not be idiomatic English or even readily understood. I first give the structural translation, explaining what the original text is; and then I use the symbol comma-dash (,-), which means "in other words" and which is then followed by a normal translation. That technique may perhaps be of some help.

Probably a "crutch" does spoil the student; but my feeling would be that in the long run, considering the total number of hours and years, you may save something by having the right sort of crutch.

Rickett Oh, I would think that for perhaps the first semester the crutch would be needed. In fact, perhaps the better the crutch available for the student, the better the situation. But after that time I begin to wonder whether you don't reach the point of a diminishing return for the crutch in terms of the final goal: That the student should go to the library, take a text he has never seen before, work on it, and be able to handle it. Of course this is our key problem and our ultimate objective.

---

* The structurality may be emphasized by the following three-phase analysis (wenyan / bairhuah / English):

Jinnshin	yan	erlyii
Yonqjinn.le shin	tzay lii.tour	jiowshyh.le
(I) exhausted-have (my) mind	in it	that's all

Put into more idiomatic English, this would be: "I have simply exhausted my mind therein", as compared with Legge: "... I do indeed exert my mind to the utmost", which contains nothing corresponding to the original yan.

The other thing is there has been a great deal of work done in bits and pieces. Somebody just mentioned Prof. Shadick's book, which I have had the pleasure of looking at. It is useful in its range of materials, which goes from the earliest texts with the last selection being, I think, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's early writing; and it is supported with quite good notes. He has a discussion of grammar which may be controversial among linguists. But I think it is a valuable piece of work which ought to be looked at.

Another thing: Hans Frankel many years ago put together something which I find very handy in helping students. That is, he has taken the major particles and given whole lists of examples of how these particles are used in various texts. It is too short, and the explanations need to be rounded out and so on; but it is a helpful piece; useful as a guide line. There are in existence many grammars prepared by people of what we might call the past generation, such as Father Mullie's grammar, which I consider a superb piece, though that is unfortunately written in Flemish, which cuts down on its usefulness. There is also some of Hirth's work. I would like to see some of this made available, through reprint or otherwise.

Mote On the subject of crutch, I should make it clear that we don't expect material processed in this manner to occupy the student throughout an entire term. This would be offered as the core item around which other things will be offered to supplement it. We do not expect to package the entire four terms, everything the student is going to encounter during that time. Rather, this would be meant as an introduction to the work in each term, for successive levels.

Mei I have never taught wenyan before, so what I am going to say could come perhaps better from Mr. Kao; but he is not here right now.

The Princeton program, as I understand, gives quizzes every week covering all the passages that have been gone over in class. There is no punctuation of those test passages, though I'm not sure if this is true in the first term. Then there are sight passage, which are punctuated.

I also saw an examination given by Achilles Fang for second year wenyan at Harvard. The examination was just a xerox of a Chinese woodblock print of a Han-shu passage. The student has to punctuate, translate, explain. That is a way of conquering the psychological block. It is also a test, not only for the student but also for the teacher, since the teacher must prepare the student for this kind of text.

It seems to me there are two questions here. One is: What sort of text should be given to the student? Here I think the more crutch in the early stage, the better. The other question is: Having these crutches and texts, what else can be done to help the student? Well, there could be sight passages, unpunctuated passages, and so on; and this applies also to other bairhuah wenshyue. Always in tests given at Harvard, there will be at least 30% that the student has never seen before, taken out of a Chinese book and xeroxed just as it is.

Mote And in addition a student normally, while he is doing this course work, is involved in seminars in history or literature, in which he doesn't have the kind of crutch he uses to begin his contact with such problems. So this doesn't represent his total exposure to training in handling materials. The language classes should be understood in the context of that larger experience which the student is undergoing.

Rickett May I ask, have you used this?

Mote I haven't myself taught from the KTHY. I've only been observing the experience of my colleagues.

Rickett I'm not sure my concern is a valid one. Maybe not. But if you feel that having used this approach has enabled you to produce results, this is useful proof. Of course, there are some students who will in any case do well, in spite of us. (Laughter)

Mote Yes, if one takes persons who have never learned to swim and shoves them into a lake, occasionally some will survive. (Laughter)

Liu At the University of Minnesota students are required to speak Chinese in class at an early stage. In more advanced Chinese classes, the romanized portion of the text is not given to the students; but tapes are made for them to practice their aural abilities. Although this is a modern Chinese course, such kinds of teaching method can easily be adapted to wenyan classes so that students at least can learn something subconsciously by continued drill.

Shih On a rather different point, after having listened this morning to the very impressive experience and knowledge of the Princeton group and also Professor Yang's analysis and illustration of his points, it seems to me that it might be good for some of you to secure a grant and have a six-week workshop for teachers of classical Chinese.

Mote Miss Shih, would you give up six weeks of your summer to attend such a course?

Shih But I said, you should get a grant, so one could .... (Laughter)

Second day, afternoon:

The Teaching of Classical Chinese (continued)

Mote I forgot to make one or two things clear this morning; so I beg your indulgence while I add a comment or two. The sample lessons before you here are not products of the Princeton classroom. Mr. Kao, who has had the most experience among the Princeton teachers using KTHY, has his own material. During the summer he was doing other research elsewhere and, more or less under his and Mr. T. T. Ch'en's guidance we asked Mr. Chao Pao-ch'u, who is not here today but who was working as a staff member of the Linguistics Project, to prepare these materials. They represent his first-stage working-out of the problem, not really incorporating Mr. Kao's experience and his own supplementary material into this. It is one temporary solution, conceived to provide you with something concrete to speak to this afternoon. It does not represent the final form in our minds nor the embodiment of our own particular experience.

The supplementary materials for the *Fifty Stories* compiled by Mrs. T'ang under Mr. Ch'en's direction have just been worked up and have never been used in class yet. They are just being used in this form for the first time this year. So they, too, have not had the benefit of practical experience in the classroom and still represent an unfinished, untested product, in that we haven't decided what kind of romanization, English and further explanation should be attached to this, so as to make it an independent product.

Rickett May I ask, though, is this complete as it stands, for what you had planned to do?

Mote No. It is complete for the five or six sample particles that are included here. The complete text, from which this is a selection, exists here in one copy only. Anybody who wishes may see it. It's about to be duplicated. For the purposes of the discussion today, we simply selected these two pages to duplicate for you so that you could see the form it has taken. If you would like to see some of the materials referred to here -- either those prepared here, or in cooperation with Harvard, or those for use at Middlebury -- please leave a note with us, and we will make sure that you get sample copies.

If you have any further corrections or suggestions on how to improve the final product, or anything you may think of, we would be grateful for them. Now we might turn to discussions of this general problem.

(Prof. Yang noted the importance of pointing out and giving students guidance in how to understand constructions more extensive than just one or two characters, such as "buh yih....hu?" or "gu....hu?" used to convey the idea of a tentative suggestion: "Shall we do such and such?")

Mote Prof. Yang, you said that you spend three or four classroom hours giving an outline of classical grammar. Do you have some notes for this?

Yang Yes, I have some. You are welcome -- anybody is -- to have them; but they are so simple and elementary that I feel ashamed to pass them on to you people. Each one of you could prepare the same thing by spending perhaps five hours or less yourself.

Chao And if twenty of us all spend five hours, that's a hundred. (Laughter)

Yang Certain very simple notes on grammar are clearly helpful to students, especially if they have good examples; but if they become too detailed, there is some risk that the student will get tired of them and just be bored.

Mote We would like very much to be a repository for such materials, generated at Harvard or at other places. We'll promise not to sit on anything but to share it out as widely as possible.

At this time, I should like to call upon Prof. Ellegiers.

Ellegiers I should say first of all that I come from a particular linguistic frame of reference, since our studies in Belgium are still heavily weighted towards the classics and our approach to linguistic analysis is affected by this. So I think it inevitable that we must continue on the same course for classical Chinese. Here we have the monumental work of Prof. Mullie -- it's 1100 pages in three volumes, and it is really a gold mine.

As far as the thirteen classics are concerned, you find all the answers in it, for the kind of problems our students have. On the basis of this, for example, I have brought with me a chart, covering the particle jy 之 , for hanging on the wall, so that we can point to items as questions arise. Maybe we can unroll it. It's rather long. You can see we're paid by the yard. (Laughter)

Now with this, we can point out to the students the functions of each use, starting with verb, demonstrative pronouns, as a particle indicating qualifying clauses, pronoun, subject of a subordinate clause, and so on. We are used, on the basis of our Latin, to talking in terms of nominative relationships and accusative relationships, datives and ablatives. Now the fact is that even for classical Chinese we can use this terminology and it fits completely in that kind of study we are used to. This chart is an example of it: This is the use of jy in the subordinate clauses, this is what we call the latent relation, with examples and translation.

We have worked out the same essential system for study of modern Chinese and Japanese, both published. And a book which won a Japanese government prize on the analysis of subordinate clauses in classical Japanese.

(Prof. Yang observed that over a third of the examples on the chart are not classical but modern)

Unfortunately, we in Belgium are quite isolated, so we want very much to work together with others who are more in the main stream.

We do not consider this in any way the last word, but we think it has something to offer; and we hope over time, through cooperation with others, to produce something yet better.

Mote How would this serve the student who doesn't come to classical Chinese with the set of questions you answer here?

Yang Well, these basic structures are what we all teach, only we don't make all these differentiations, just the more important ones. Most English-speaking students are happier with simpler structures. Actually, of course, some of the older Chinese scholars, like Ma Chien-tung, who had a Latin education, approached analysis this same general way.

Stimson Is this based upon Mullie's grammar?

Ellegiers No, this is from Le mot particule Tche. It is merely codified for the convenient use of the student, covering only that one word.

COFFEE BREAK, during which the chart is also examined.

Mote I wonder if I can get Professor Kao to outline the way we approach the teaching of classical Chinese at Princeton.

Kao We have a two-year program, really a sort of package deal. The student has to take two years. More or less the first year is for basic training using the Mencius or the Analects for the first term and Shih Chi for the second term. Sometimes we use Fifty Stories to introduce students to the classical style but not necessarily always. When I taught this course two years ago, I didn't use Fifty Stories, but started with Lun Yü directly. The second year is an advanced course. We hope that all the students in Chinese, even those in modern history, will take this course; but they don't have to. I think it is for the students themselves to decide whether they should take the second year of classical Chinese or not. Most of the students in the course tend to be primarily interested in literature or ancient history. I think in either case they should know something about parallel prose, though whether or not they become proficient in handling it will of course depend upon their future training.

Mr. Dien's question, about whether it is advisable to use Mencius as a beginning text, has been discussed many times before. Mr. Bodman pointed out that the graphs in Mencius are found also in a lot of other texts. I think this is one reason we pick Mencius. Also both Mr. Yang and Mr. Dien have mentioned the importance of unified style, and Mr. Yang mentioned that even in the Lun Yü you have different types of style. If you use T'ang and Sung prose, you will also probably find variations of style -- They are not really so unified as you think. Han Yü and Ou-yang Hsiu are stylistically different, even more so than the differences we find among the chapters of the Mencius. That is another reason why we use Mencius.

However, I think you can learn classical Chinese beginning with any kind of textbook. Therefore what Prof. Shih and Mr. Dien have said is relevant: Miss Shih proposed that we shall produce a sort of paperback like what other foreign language departments are using, in German or Greek or Latin, a pamphlet with perhaps two or three selections in each book. Then the teacher will have more flexibility to choose the text he wants. I think right now we probably don't need very bulky books of introduction to classical Chinese, because each teacher has his own theory. If we have ten or twenty choices of paperback pamphlet, the teacher may start a class in Chinese with any of these selections. So if you want to start with T'ang and Sung prose, you may pick, say, Vol. 15 instead of Vol. 1.

My own supplementary text is substantially different from the text Mr. P. C. Chao prepared, which you have in front of you. My own text has unpunctuated Chinese text with punctuated Y. R. Chao [G. R.] Romanization side by side, much like Mr. Chao's. It would be helpful if we produced small pamphlets with all glossary items in the back arranged in alphabetical order so that student can easily refer to the glossary for new words rather than finding them with great difficulty in many different dictionaries. Grammatical notes should be underneath the text and in English. If we want to use Chinese to explain terms, I would use only the most high-frequency words for such explanations.

Mote Thank you. I am glad to report that even in this very small university, with a small number of students and limited resources, the students have many alternatives to this particular package. It should never seem that we are setting up an ultimate or rigid solution containing everything within it.

Ellegiers I have a basic question. Is this handbook intended for students or for teachers? If it is for students, for example, you give the Legge's translation and, as our colleague from Stockholm pointed out, there are some mistakes in it. Shouldn't there be preferential translations, indicating the mistakes? For example, the particle ian/yan that was mentioned this morning: Legge missed the meaning of that completely. If you give this to the students and if, as you said this morning, it is not intended to be worked out completely during a course, that means that the student will continue on his own with this handbook. At least there should be corrections of the translation. Otherwise how can a student of first or second year classical Chinese find out by himself that Legge is mistaken?

Mote This is a very good point. We've talked about this. As a matter of fact, there are disagreements between the Legge translation and the bairhuah translation. This bothered us, and we wondered if we should underline all such discrepancies or not. But we decided that these things are all tools for getting at the original Mencius and that Legge at least represents a kind of tradition which it is useful for the students to know about. To reconstruct the way in which Legge got to his particular translation is something the students should learn about. We do not intend to limit this to Legge. We hope to expose students to all the important translations of Mencius and are going to print them, not all of them for each selection but examples of each of various points, to enable the students to become aware of them all. The Legge translation is historically important, because it represents our English rendering of a tradition that dominated Chinese scholarship for a thousand years and with which the student would have to come in contact anyway. It may make occasional mistakes, but it is nevertheless an important reference point. I think it justifiable for the students to have some experience in using it and comparing it with the original.

We wouldn't regard any as "the correct translation", but simply as one of the tools which exist within the accumulated scholarship on Mencius, which the student should know about.

Ellegiers You use Legge, of course, because it's in English. There is also one in German, an old translation by Faber, and that is very close to the text grammatically -- closer than Legge.

(Professor Yang observed that other translations betray discrepancies: In Fifty Chinese Stories, the Japanese rendering is different from the bairhuah, and the Japanese is correct.)

Rickett I still feel that I much prefer the format that Mr. Kao has. For the very beginning, perhaps, these translations are useful. After that I am not sure that a translation is required. The student should be encouraged to use his analytical ability to tackle the text rather than relying on all sorts of help. I hate to use the word "crutch" again, but if the student has something like this to look at, he's going to look at it first, no matter what you tell him. He won't use it to check back on his own work. I really think the important problem the student faces is using his own analytical ability. If he gets too many kinds of help, you are setting up the wrong sort of psychological attitude, and he will simply rely on somebody else's analysis. Admittedly, at the beginning stages, anything that can get the student into this easily is fine; but it can easily be carried on too far. I really feel it is best to have the unpunctuated text accompanied by a punctuated Romanization text, so the student gets used to looking at an unpunctuated text but does have the aid of a punctuated Romanization. From those he can easily refer to a glossary in the back of the books for vocabulary and notes.

Mote Mr. Kao has raised the question whether the English is necessary at all, whether it might not better be relegated to an appendix, to get it out of the way. But you are not making any comment on the presence of the bairhuah translation.

Rickett Well, I don't like the bairhuah either, to tell the truth.

Mote Do you teach Mencius in English?

Rickett Yes, I do.

Mote — Well, if you don't teach Mencius in English, it is very useful to have a modern Chinese model established, a version on the basis of which the students can more actively talk about it.

Rickett — I would not be against having such material perhaps appended in the back. Or having it for the teachers to refer to, that is very handy. But for Fifty Stories, which is my main experience with using such things, I felt that the student, starting out with this, had something to cling to. But also I found that the students' translation invariably followed the bairhuah translation, which on several occasions was not correct, or at least chose one of several different versions which are equally acceptable. But the students didn't think about those. Their approach was to go first to the bairhuah, no matter what I told them in the class, then to go back and try to figure out how the classical got to the bairhuah, rather than anything else.

Mote — Well, this text would in any case not really be designed for your purposes. If you're going to teach Mencius in English, you don't really need to worry about discussing Mencius in still another language, modern spoken Chinese, or about getting textual material that would facilitate such an exercise.

Rickett — Well, frankly, I don't think I could teach Mencius entirely in Chinese.

Kierman — Aren't we establishing an either-or situation, quite unnecessarily? The thing that seems to me perfectly obvious is that, if it is a good idea gradually to wean (let's get away from that "crutch") -- gradually to wean the student away from such aids, that is perfectly easy to do. Just start gradually taking these facilities away or make them a little more difficult to get at. For example, you can take your English translation and put it on the back of the sheet rather than on the facing page or the same page, so that it isn't right there for him to look at immediately. You can do the same thing with the bairhuah. And you can perhaps simply dispense with some of these at a later stage. You can figure out which of such items you want to leave till the last, which fig-leaf is to be the last thing you're going to drop. And finally, at the end of the course you'll wind up with the student face to face with ...

Chao — ... the naked text? (Laughter)

Kierman — Exactly. And unpunctuated, too.

Kao — Mrs. Pian has some ideas on how to compromise in matters of aids. Maybe she will be willing to speak for herself.

Pian — For the sake of efficiency, some of the explanations should be done in English and some of the drilling or practicing with Chinese be saved for special drill sessions which can be used for the student's memorization, for pattern drill, and also for explaining the wenyan in bairhuah. Leave this sort of thing for a special drill-hour. That was my suggestion.

Shih I recall when I started Shakespeare in high school, I found the thorough annotation very helpful, but I certainly don't want Shakespeare translated into Chinese and printed by the side of the English. I think this would hinder my appreciation of it. For example: "To be or not to be" is translated by Liang Shih-chiu as "是或不是". (Laughter) If I had difficulty understanding the sense of a certain passage, I would perhaps go to a Chinese translation like Liang's; but you cannot get the feeling from any translation.

Mote When you read Shakespeare, were you learning English or studying literature?

Shih Learning English; we studied Shakespeare in high school.

Mote Well, it's a great question whether the English belongs in our text at all, and if so where. But the important thing for us right now is whether, with the compromises Mrs. Pian speaks of, modern standard Chinese should be there for the student's reference.

Shih When I used that technique at Pomona, the students liked it. I tried to play the *bairhuah* down by giving the students a supplementary vocabulary list with which to pursue their discussion of the text. But the students still wanted the translation. I like Dr. Chao's structural translation, which is much more meaningful although it is not elegant Chinese.

Mote Do you suppose we can get Dr. Chao to undertake this?

Yang When I was in junior high school there was the *Ssu-shu ching-i* 四書精義 which was almost a word-for-word translation. Sometimes you would even have to reverse some words in a sentence so as to get a sensible meaning. This has been tried several times with varying degrees of success.

Chao This point about structural translation applies both to translations of *wenyan* into *bairhuah* and *wenyan* into English. If the structural translation is too unwieldy, you just add an idiomatic equivalent.

Shih I think we need very good and thorough annotation, rather too much than not enough. That saves time -- class time.

Mote I think we're all pretty well agreed on what we want and still more clearly what we want to avoid: Sitting in class and having students recite slowly, proving only that they can decipher the text. We want to have the most efficient means of limiting such waste of classroom time -- that is, we want a crutch -- but we don't want to have the student become excessively dependent upon it.

Ruhlmann When I was a student myself and was reading *Meng Tzu* and *Lun Yü*, in the Couvreur translation, you have on the same double page the Chinese text, the romanization, the Latin translation, and the French translation. The Latin translation happens to be more faithful to the Chinese than the French; so I as a beginner found it easiest to go from the French to the Latin, to the Chinese text, with reference all the time to the romanization.

Gould May I ask a question? Would this greater faithfulness of the Latin translation to the Chinese be due to any similarity between those two languages; or is it just that Couvreur felt under no compulsion to write idiomatic Latin,whereas he had to write idiomatic French?

Yang I think there's something to that, definitely.

Ellegiers I should like to comment further on the possible use of Latin. It has many possibilities, due to its inherent flexibility. If you come across an accusative case, you can put the word anywhere and thus you can come much closer to a Chinese text because you can put an accusative case where you have it in Chinese.

Mote Are you suggesting that there is an accusative case in Chinese? (Laughter) Ellegiers Nods (Louder Laughter)

Ruhlmann I think there is a perhaps somewhat deceptive similarity between Chinese and Latin, because in Latin one word corresponds to one character in Chinese, whereas in modern European languages the correspondence is simply not so close, word for word.

Gould I would suggest that the only reason why you can put the accusative case wherever "accusative cases" go when you're writing Latin is that there is no Latin today. In other words, there are no people who would look at that accusative case and say, "It is in an ungrammatical position". That is, there are no people for whom Latin is a native language.

Ruhlmann What we mean is that Latin has now become an artificial language.

Gould That's right. It would be quite wrong to draw any conclusions about interrelations between Latin and Chinese, or French or Chinese.

Mote Professor Malmqvist?

Malmqvist I would suggest that it would be useful to the student if, for each selection, we gave a list of existing translations. Very often you find that students have difficulty finding out whom to consult for their work. You can list all the available translations (Couvreur, Legge, Dobson, and so on) and also give your comments under each title, and thus it will be easier for the students to know which one version we considered good. This is especially true when one comes to poetry. I find it useful sometimes to confront the students with several different translations of a Chinese poem and ask them to criticize them in comparison with the original.

Chao Have you considered the possibility of an annotated Legge or Couvreur? (Laughter)

Mote What sort of annotation would you like, Dr. Chao?

Chao Just something that will be more structural in its approach, as I indicated earlier.

Ellegiers Well, there are occasional cases of this. For example, there is a very extensive commentary by Karlgren on Franke's translation of passages from the *Shih Chi*.

Norman I want to bring up something entirely different. In the sort of little book that Mr. Kao mentioned, I wonder how many people think would it be useful, either in the vocabulary or in the transcription itself, to have a transcription of some nature that would show the ancient phonetic features of Chinese. This wouldn't have to be used if you just put it in -- if a teacher didn't like this or didn't understand it or didn't think it was important. But I think it is an important part of the study of Chinese to some people.

Kao If we had a little book on T'ang poetry, indicating the sounds of that period, that would be very helpful. I really hope that Prof. Chao's new romanization and transcription called *tongtzyh* will soon be published. In that case we could really put T'ang poetry into *tongtzyh*.

Norman Not only T'ang poetry but also the classics, pre-Han prose. Even though the transcription may only reflect the T'ang dynasty or even later, at least it's that much closer to the original; and that is sometimes extremely relevant to the interpretation. Certainly the whole question of the fusion-words often doesn't make much sense unless you know some form of Chinese other than Mandarin.

Chao The *tongtzyh* is only in a very rough draft.

Ch'en, L. I asked Prof. Chao this morning whether we should introduce *wenyan* immediately after spoken Chinese, or should introduce such *wenyan* as Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's work before we start *Meng Tzu* or the *Shih Ching*. Most of our students, we have found, like to read journal or magazine articles and some such later work. So on our campus now, we first introduce them to a number of particles, basing ourselves on Lü Shu-hsiang's *Wen-yen hsü-tz'u*, and then we give them a group of short passages from magazines, going back only as far as Liang's work. If any of the students would like to study more *wenyan*, then we give them the *Shih Ching* or *Mencius*, *Shih Chi* and *Tso Chuan*. My question is whether we should introduce them to the *Shih Ching* immediately after, say, the *Fifty Stories* or should give them more modern *wenyan*.

Kao I think either is all right. You can do it one way or the other. Our students generally prefer to go right away to early classics because they are mainly interested in Chinese civilization. Many students, who are more interested in modern literature, would probably want a short cut. It is very much a matter of the teacher's and the student's interest.

I do not like to introduce students to the *Fifty Stories* to start with. At the very beginning they tend to proceed at a very slow pace; and under such conditions they would like to have something of tremendous value, such as the Analects. They even like to memorize some passages. I don't ask them to memorize but I usually do give them dictation, which is pretty close to the same thing. I have found that they like to memorize a few passages of Lun Yü and a few lines from the Shih Ching. This can be very useful in their future. Later, when they can proceed at a faster pace, I introduce them to the Shih Chi and Han Shu.

I use English translations at the very beginning, but not Legge's, which they can find themselves. I think Waley's translation is better. Usually the students can find many translations and can make a comparative study of these. You don't need to help them with this.

Rickett I don't encourage students to go to translations on their own; but I sometimes do give them sets of varying translations in class and present the problem of how the translator got this particular rendition. I think this is helpful, because it does get them thinking about the various possibilities and using their own analytical ability. I think this kind of approach again is better than one in which they tend to be bound by something that is presented, even though they are told that it is wrong. Since they haven't done the work themselves but have gone to a translation, either surreptitiously or openly, this tends to set up a pattern in their minds. But certainly using the various translations as a teaching tool to get them to use their heads and come up with something -- good or bad, right or wrong, it doesn't matter. The important thing is that they reason it out for themselves.

Mote Professor Ch'en, would you like to respond.

Ch'en, L. Well, many of the students taking Chinese language courses at our campus are majoring in Political Science or International Relations or History. They would like to get a basic knowledge of Chinese so that they can read books in their subject fields. And especially, there are so many articles put out in modern wenyan that our students don't want to spend too much time studying Meng Tzu (Mencius) or the Shih Chi. They have a limited time to spend on their language courses and they feel that they should become able at least to read articles in the newspapers. We are not trying to train sinologists at our campus, and so far people seem reasonably well satisfied with our approach. I am not saying that we are not interested in KTHY. It is very much worth while. We do have some students interested in the classics, but the majority have a different program in mind.

Kao Well, you know, I don't think our students at Princeton really want to become sinologists, either. I think they just want to become Renaissance men. (Laughter)

Stimson One of the things that strikes me about Wang Li is how much background he apparently does not assume on behalf of the presumable Chinese students he writes his notes for. There must be a great change in the preparation of Chinese students coming to the universities now.

Malmqvist I think that both Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and Hu Shih were once asked to furnish lists of literature that a Chinese student of medicine or technology would need if he were to commence reading in Chinese traditional culture. I think one of those lists included the Ssu-pu pei-yao 四都備要*. (Laughter, loud and prolonged)

Mei I think Prof. Malmqvist's remark does throw light on another aspect. In reading, in order to do any research work, one has to read pretty fast. It does seem to me that if a student is given the work in the beginning without any supplementary crutches, he may develop a habit, whenever he comes to a wenyan text, of doing a sort of deciphering. That habit is one which I think we should discourage in the very beginning. Getting back to the truism: There are some things which the student should read with care and some with speed. The habit of reading with speed in a foreign language is something which has to begin rather early.

I have been somewhat disconcerted by a number of remarks: That is, you have talked about a list of reference books, and a list of translations, and so on. If I were an American undergraduate, taking four or five courses -- and they have girls on their minds and other things to do -- with all these distractions, they have to learn Chinese. These all seem to me very urgent reasons why they should be given some "crutches" and conditions under which they can read with enough speed eventually to turn the language into a serious research tool instead of a set of paragraphs.

In my own experience, I find many things which I am supposed to have read and enjoyed; but when I try to explain them, in the process of teaching, I find there are many things I don't know. Now of course in part this is carelessness on my part; but I do think that when a person gets to the point of really doing research work, he will have to be 一知半解 · 讀書不求甚解**. Get the passage, read it quickly, get the main points, and then use it. I think the sort of preparation which we ought to provide should commence at the very beginning to inculcate this habit of reading texts at a certain pace -- five or ten or even fifteen pages an hour, which I take as a minimum requirement if classical Chinese is to be a useful tool.

Chao On the point of 不求甚解 I always insist, both for bairhuah and wenyan, that we should teach American students to follow the old Chinese custom of just doing the text from the audio-lingual approach and sooner or later -- we seem to be demanding sooner, but in any case sooner or later -- they will understand it. (Laughter)

---

* A collection of several thousand volumes comprising virtually the whole of Chinese traditional culture.

** The first of these two quotations means different things in different contexts. Here it might be translated: "Understand the whole but only half explicate it". The second quotation, from T'ao Yüan-ming, is somewhat less chameleon-like, meaning something like: "Read without seeking extreme clarification". Either expression can be used in a more or less pejorative sense to describe persons whose understanding is less than it might be.

One important thing is that if you really get the hang of the thing, whether wenyan or bairhuah , you acquire the facility that one does in reading a language: When you read the first half of a sentence, you anticipate how the second half is going to go. You have a feel for the structure. This makes you read faster and also makes you understand better. If every word comes as a surprise, something new, then you really find it very difficult to extract meaning. The kind of feel I am talking about may come, I suppose, either before or after the stage of close analysis.

Ruhlmann For a student's first contact with any linguistic fact or style, we have to choose between two approaches, which I will exaggeratedly define. One is reading very little material but trying to understand it fully. The other is reading much more material superficially but fast. Perhaps we should choose the second in the hope that, in the long run, the student will work his way back to some middle ground. Certainly if the ultimate aim is, say, to read Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and understand it at the first contact, rather than Lun Yü or Meng Tzu, we should adopt the second way.

Chao You can read Meng Tzu and Lun Yü fast, too. (Laughter)

Kao That is my point, too. You can teach Meng Tzu and let students read slowly; but you can also devise a kind of textbook that will enable the student to read Mencius reasonably fast. For instance, you can tell the students, "I want you to answer the following questions from the Mencius." Ask the questions first, then pick the text and let them read through. With those questions in mind, they will certainly read faster. I prefer myself to have students read the original wenyan; but I think maybe some real scholar such as Prof. Yang, who can write wenyan like Meng Tzu or Ssu-ma Chien, should produce some kind of text with controlled vocabulary for the students to use as a text supplement for rapid reading only. Not for recitation, but only for rapid reading outside of class.

Mote A Wen-yen ju-men? (Laughter)

Kao No, not a text like Wen-yen ju-men, but rather supplementary texts just for outside reading. Much like T. T. Ch'en's Tarn Butyng. Only this would be in wenyan. You can use the vocabulary of Mencius, for instance, to read the supplementary materials. And both those and the Fifty Stories are very useful for the students wishing to understand modern wenyan.

Yang You can use ancient texts but remove rarely-used words or compounds and substitute later and more easily-understandable ones. In other words, you could produce a modified version, an easier version.

Mote This comes dangerously close to the doctored bairhuah texts, which I for one highly disapprove of.

Yang But if you do have a large round of agreement, among people who practise writing in Chinese, that this is still pretty good stuff, that it is still a living language ...

Chao

But if you doctor up a classical text, you have to make very precise use of particles and such characteristic words.

Yang

Surely.

Ch'en, T.T.

We at Princeton have one basic assumption: That we are going to use spoken Chinese as a medium of teaching classical Chinese. Thus many of the aids we need would be designed to facilitate that means of teaching in the classroom. Also we believe the assimilation of text is a useful means of learning *wenyan* and that the romanized text is also useful for that purpose. We also hope to have some tapes made from the text, to serve as a students' aid in assimilation.

Mote

Yes, that third dimension, of sound, is a very important one, carried over from our methods in teaching modern Chinese.

Well, I thought that it was very useful yesterday to hear Dr. Chao's summary notes of wisdom on what emerged from the day's proceedings. I wonder if we might do that again...

Chao

Well, the wisdom has come from everybody. I've just been noting them down, and not all of the ideas, at that.

However, it does seem that after these discussions many aspects which were not explicit before are now much clearer in our minds. We asked such questions as whether we should teach the *Meng Tzu* style first or Liang Ch'i-ch'ao first for *wenyan*. It seems that different institutions may have different programs. And, in either case, if you have started with an intensive colloquial program, of course you might as well make use of that fact and thus approximate the approach of Chinese students to *wenyan*, which would be a great advantage.

I mentioned the audio-lingual approach, which is emphasized everywhere in connection with the teaching of *bairhuah* and which can be applied to the study of *wenyan*, with or without crutches. I believe that in some cases and at some stage the two approaches (the 不求甚解 procedure and the close analysis procedure) can perhaps be used either at the same time or one before and one after the other. In other words, *bingshyng bubey* 並行不悖 ["Parallel but not conflicting"]. One issue I meant to mention is whether -- when we come closer to the preparation of texts -- words, idioms, or compounds which are now no longer used in *wenyan* should be included, if our text is of limited extent. Obviously, this is a choice that will come up during the actual compilation.

Mote

Could you perhaps expand a little on that?

Chao

Well, for example, some of the items we were looking at in our examples of dictionary entries yesterday are hardly used in *wenyan* now. Some of them occur, in fact, rather infrequently even in classical *wenyan*; so unless they happened to be in a passage you particularly wanted to use as a text, there would be no reason to include them.

As to the division of periods, I am personally inclined towards emphasizing the later period materials rather than the older because the later includes the older by its cumulative effect. Also the later will be useful both for students seriously interested in philological studies and also for those students of Chinese who want to read modern materials on current affairs in wenyan.

Mote Could you give us some dates for what you call the later period?

Chao By later period, I mean post-T'ang and Sung. Liang Ch'i-ch'ao would be included. (Laughter)

Finally, there remains the question of what scale, in terms of manpower, we plan to use in order to turn out teaching materials. Will we serve the needs of one kind of students or of several kinds? This of course would require our getting some idea of how many students are likely to be interested in learning classical Chinese and what their purposes are likely to be.

Mote Thank you very much. (Meeting adjourned)

Program of 3rd year Vernacular Chinese Course
as given 1964-67

Mei & Pian 1967

Unit I

a. 魯迅：吶喊自序

b. [許欽文：吶喊自序分析]

c. [周曄：我的伯父魯迅]

6 hrs. in class. Read Discuss. Theme comparing the 2 commentaries.

Unit II

a. 周法高：何謂漢學 (plus Rom.)

9 hrs. in class. Theme on

b. [梁啟超：治國學雜談]

Delivered by instructor in class (1 hr.) like a lecture. Students should have gone over text already.

c. Special report on a Sinological topic. Delivered orally by students. 4 hrs.

Unit III

水滸傳 44 pp. 16 hrs. Read; Summarize. Plots; Discussion.

Unit IV

[金門馬祖問題 News paper editorial] 2 hrs. Discussion

Theme: Commenting on the editorial.

Unit V

a. [費孝通：我這一年] 2 hrs. Discussion.

b. [馮友蘭：我參加了革命] 2 hrs. Discussion

Theme: Comparing the 2 personalities.

Spring Term

(Unit III Cont.) 水滸傳 10 pp. 4 hrs.

b. [打虎 episode 8 pp. without voc.] relate in class. 1 hrr.

Unit VI

a. [Chih, Primer of News Paper Chinese] Assigned to read 2 wks. 1 hr. Questions & Answers.

b. [閔石麟 美軍在南韓失敗之原因] Disc. 1 hr.

c. Selected News Paper items. Read in class. 2 hrs.

d. [中央日報 Editorial on Vietnam War] Disc. 1 hr. Theme.

e. [Editorial: 詹森總統的大社會] 2 hrs. debate. Theme.

Unit VII

a. 軟体動物 6 hrs. Reading aloud; Acting out.

b. 狐假虎威 1 hr. Mem. 文言 Version

c. 北風跟太陽 1 hr. Mem. 文言 Version
1 hr. Mem. 白話 Version

Unit VIII

a. 梅 Lecture: Dialectical Materialism. Vocab. given before-hand. 1 hr. Students hand in notes taken from lecture; Question from students 1 hr.

b. [錢穆：唐宋時代之文化] 1 hr. discuss.

c. [毛澤東：中國社會各階級的分析] 2 hrs. Disc.

Unit IX

a. [胡適：非各人主義的新生活 no voc.] 3 hrs. Disc.

b. 朱自清：諸子篇 from 經典常談 no voc. 5 hrs. Read, Disc.

c. [老舍：我這一輩子 38 pp. no voc.] 5 hrs. Disc.

Third day, morning:

Problems of Vernacular Chinese

Mote I had originally intended to call this session "Our Failure in Teaching Spoken Chinese", but I abandoned the idea because it seemed an excessively pessimistic way to start anything. Nevertheless, I do still feel that we have failed, perhaps not so much in teaching the spoken language as in devising ways to maintain the student's skill once he has acquired it.

We here start off with a great emphasis on spoken Chinese in the first year, and we have excellent institutions for teaching the language intensively which are highly successful -- the Middlebury summer school and the Taiwan Center, both of which you will hear about later on -- but the sad fact is that students who take advantage of those fine programs then return to a curriculum shared with others whose understanding of and feel for the language is infinitely inferior to theirs. I am sorry to say that the usual adjustment is that the superior student simply loses the fine edge and fluency of his spoken Chinese and retreats into the herd, content to devote most of his energy to the written language and literature.

I find myself sounding pretty pessimistic in spite of my resolution to accent the positive, so I had better desist and turn things over to somebody who is doing something positive about teaching modern spoken Chinese, Mrs. Pian of Harvard.

Mrs. Pian Since it seems best to discuss this subject using concrete examples, I shall commence with an outline of one of our third-year courses. Mei Tsu-lin and I organized this course in 1964 and one or both of us have taught it since then. The outline in the handout gives a general picture of its content procedures, and allocation of hours, though small adjustments have been made from year to year.

As you see, we have grouped the materials into units which are introduced roughly in this order. We staggered the schedule on the longer works so as to provide relief and variety for the students. For example, Shui Hu Chuan is read every Monday and Wednesday, but on Fridays we discuss current events articles. After the Shui Hu selections, we take another longer work in the same way, alternating with other materials of a very different nature.

The classes are conducted entirely in Chinese. Many articles(given in brackets on the handout) are read outside of the classroom, with class hours devoted to discussion of the subject-matter. There are regularly-assigned compositions, three to five pages long. We try to provide very full vocabulary sheets for all articles except the few works (including, for example, a movelette) which are assigned towards the end of the year, for speed reading or "guess"-reading and for which no vocabulary is given at all. In compiling vocabularies, we do not attempt to avoid duplication. As a guide for deciding what to include on vocabulary lists, for all works, we have simply used the level of our intermediate course.

You can see from this list that we are trying to give the students a sample of journalistic and functional styles, the styles of traditional and modern fiction, the highly individual Lu Hsün style, as well as the colloquial but very technical piece by Chou Fa-Kao.

Methods in our class routine depend largely upon the contents of these articles. Lu Hsün is popular with the students, both as a writer and as a subject of study; for us it is a good opportunity to impress upon the students the difficulty of his style. In order to make it possible to talk in class about what we read, we have had to compile a concordance of sayable equivalents to the numerous unsayable expressions Lu Hsün used.

In Unit II we wanted to send the students to the Chinese Library to acquaint them with reference works. Last year, we happened to have several linguistics majors in the class, so our questions were weighted heavily in this direction. As a matter of fact, we feel that students who have gone this far in Chinese studies ought to have some superficial knowledge of Chinese historical phonology and know at least some names and book titles in the sinological field. Oral reports force them to talk in an organized fashion.

In Unit III, Shui Hu was selected to give the students something that holds their interest over a longer period of time. In class we read the text closely and often have very detailed discussions of grammatical points.

In journalistic materials (IV, V, VI) we try to choose controversial topics simply to stir up arguments among the students. Class discussion is always lively. One year a freshman from Radcliffe was the only Goldwater Republican in the class. You can imagine her position when the subject of the Great Society was discussed. Like a good Republican, she held her ground firmly and delivered some eloquent speeches in Mandarin.

Unit VII is an attempt to give the students some feeling of wenyan rhythm. Ideally, I would like to include a little more material of this sort. I understand that Kao Yu-kung is making his 3rd year students memorize some pyan-tii wen pieces specifically for the sake of acquiring a sense of that rhythm, which is so common in Chinese prose.

In Unit VIII, the contents are more involved and provide the basis for lengthy discussions. In Unit IV we pretend this is no longer a language course.

Once such a framework is established, it would be desirable to have alternative pieces for variety, for example, some complete San-Yan stories could replace Shui Hu occasionally. Some Ku Chieh-kang articles would be useful for sinological topics; Ts'ao Yü's play, Jih Ch'u, Lao Sh'e's novels, Lo-t'o Hsiang-tzu or Li Hun are suitable for longer, speed reading materials on this level.

In third-year Chinese we have not so far tried to do anything about pronunciation. I have often thought, however, of having a clinic for those who still need drill to correct bad speech habits.

Students at this phase still make errors of usage, of using locutions that are rooted in English idiom rather than Chinese, or of style.

(At this point Mrs. Pian gave a number of varying examples of typical student gaucheries.)

I think that all such problems should be considered on the third-year level. Although we spend our time discussing the content of what we read, it is after all a course to help students improve their understanding of the language, even if they cannot be expected to master it. One of our troubles now is that, while on the one hand, we want the students to come in contact with a variety of styles, on the other hand, we also want them to write coherently and idiomatically, something best learned by imitating a single acceptable style. One reason why we require composition is that we believe the students learn vocabulary more efficiently by active work. However, new vocabulary occasionally involves new structural problems too and certainly some words are more suitable than others in a particular style, which is often difficult to explain to students. For example, guafen 瓜分 'to divide' or jianruey-huah 尖銳化 'to intensify' are used in more restricted ways than their opponent English equivalents. Our vocabulary sheets will have to give much more information than they now do if we expect students to use such words correctly.

If our concern is to have the students learn to write in a clear, functional style -- not even necessarily always sayable -- we really should concentrate on more works in a single style for the students to imitate. But it is difficult to find many texts that satisfy our needs in both style and content.

In a way, our students are like students in China, who are constantly dealing with works in unsayable Chinese; but our students lack the stabilizing influence of a standard daily speech outside the classroom. I have often been annoyed to see a student adopt some awkward expression from a modern Chinese writer. I sometimes wonder whether it would not be wiser to keep students from writing compositions before their spoken foundation is firmly established. Perhaps it is just a matter of reaching a proper balance. Since the chief aim in such a course as ours is the study of the modern Chinese language itself, even acquiring a wide vocabulary or learning to write intelligibly are relatively secondary considerations; and this should be our guide in selecting materials. Nevertheless, I still think exercises in composition are important. It involves the students deeply in the basic structure of the language, and this struggle with the problems of style and word-usage is as rewarding as it is difficult.

(The question of rapid reading, raised the previous day was mentioned again)

Mei — I haven't done any theoretical study in this regard, but I have made some approaches to it as a practical problem, with regard to how many pages one can reasonably assign a student.

My experience of teaching fourth year Chinese, which I have done for the last three years, is that when the students come into the fourth year, I expect them to read five pages an hour with prepared vocabulary; and during the second term of that fourth year, I expect them to read about ten pages of Hu Shih, without vocabulary. This is obviously a potentially misleading measure, since some students will simply spend more time than others. However, perhaps the general frame for estimating is set by the fact that the final exam for third year always has a sight passage of five to eight pages, and the student is expected to read it in about 45 minutes to an hour. Thus, about five pages an hour, under the sort of pressure one finds in exams. Naturally some do it and some don't, but that is the standard.

The students are tested by being asked to summarize the main idea of each paragraph. Alternatively, true-false questions are used. Thus about five pages an hour of text that is not too difficult, but not too easy either, is what one might reasonably expect to achieve. And on the fourth year, perhaps over ten pages. I don't know whether this matches others' experience.

Mote — How does this match up with what you do in Sweden, Professor Malmqvist.

Malmqvist — I wish it did. I mean, I wish we could effectively demand that our students meet this same standard.

Mei — Of course, what you really need in order to do effective research on a topic of any significance is up to thirty pages an hour,possibly not absorbing every single character, but understanding the sense. After all, that's what you need in order to do research with reasonable efficiency. Here too, of course, individual needs vary. I feel, however, that anything less than this would not give the student the kind of critical mass to really extract the relevant information he needs.

Ellegiers — This is the first time I have heard about speed-reading. I don't see the use of it. On the contrary, we insist on close and essentially slow reading. Isn't the real test whether one is able to get everything out of a document that is in it?

Ruhlmann — Perhaps in the 22nd century intellectuals will all be educated from the age of 5 to 50 rather than, as now, from 5 to 40. (Laughter)

Kao — We give the students a number of different speeds, or try to. I have a program somewhat similar to Mr. Mei's, but I overlap all these. I let the students read a number of children's books, which are really very easy and which they can read for enjoyment and for meaning. We have weekly discussions, just of the plots, not of the language; and we also let them read things like the little red book and "Diary of a Red Guard". Then after perhaps ten minutes of this, I get them to read a good solid academic article, which they must read much slower. I have speed-reading but I also have poetry, which nobody can effectively read fast. I think such variation of pace keeps the students from getting bored.

Shih When I taught vernacular Chinese in the fourth year, both Mr. Kao and Miss Liu were my colleagues. I gave the students assignment to read plays of Lu Hsün and then Lao She's Lo-t'o Hsiang-tzu. At the time they were used to reading one or two pages per assignment; so the first week I gave two and the second week I gave four pages per assignment, and the third week ten pages. Then we proceeded to 40 pages per assignment. In the middle of the semester they said, "Slow down," but they could read and translate. I talked with Miss Liu about this, and told her how well they were doing. She told me that one of the students who happened to be her neighbor spent from ten to twelve hours to prepare the assignment. But anyway we finished the novel in about three weeks and the students enjoyed it.

Of course that was a very remarkable class: They all had their master's degree in Chinese. I could play on their sense of competition because one student came from England, two from Stanford, two more from Berkeley, and so on. They really competed and did very well. I am sure they didn't get everything from the novel but they could understand and translate. If we had stuck to the speed they had been used to, one or two pages per assignment, perhaps we wouldn't have finished it in a year.

Mote And they would long since have become bored with it.

Shih Yes. In addition to Lo-t'o hsiang-tzu and three Lu Hsün plays, in one semester, one student read Ts'ao Yü's four-act play Jih-ch'u and we made tape recordings: I invited Mr. Kao and Miss Liu and also had some of the students take part, and we read part of the play. The next year, I understand, the student who had read it all was at another school, teaching Jih-ch'u. (Laughter)

Mote I think the real answer to Mr. Ellegiers' question on speed reading is that one must frequently, in doing research, get over a considerable body of material quickly. That doesn't mean that you limit yourself to that sort of reading; but it is a very useful capacity to have.

I think I'll ask Mr. Dew to talk about his experience during his tenure as director of the Stanford Center.

Dew I will outline what I see as the problems we face in this country, that is, outside Taiwan, in the classroom situation teaching spoken Chinese, and the ways the Taipei Center fits into this program. In terms of one, two, three, I think the principal problem we face in teaching spoken language here in the classroom is one of exposure. There isn't enough time to teach spoken language at the first year level, at the second year, or even at the third year level; because the student has five hours a week for Chinese and the rest of his time is spent on something else. Even if he has ten hours a week for Chinese, the other half of his time will be spent on something else. There isn't sufficient exposure because of class size as well as of limited time. We deal with students in groups of from five to fifteen. In my second year course at Ann Arbor this term we had 22, though I did split that into two drill classes. The students in a large group do not get sufficient exposure in terms of listening or of his own production. We are also hampered in our attempt to teach spoken language by the students' need to get on with reading. They don't have the time to spend two or three intensive years of 10 hours a week learning to really handle the spoken language because their primary interest and need is learning to read. Outside the classroom there is no exposure to Chinese except of course in the laboratory. There's nothing on the street. I think this is the principal problem. The simple inadequacy of time available to do what must be done if the student is to acquire real competence in the language.

Beyond the problem of exposure, there is the problem of materials. We have several good texts now for first year Chinese. Once we get beyond that level, the number of good texts decreases rapidly. So the principal significance of the text problem is at the intermediate level and the advanced level. There is also the problem of finding well trained teaching personnel. I don't think there is much to be said about that problem, except that it exists and must be dealt with.

These are the three aspects of the problem which I had originally noted down. During our first session, while we discussed the student's glossary for teaching literary Chinese, I got a fourth which I think we have overlooked: The problem of dealing at the same time with the good student and the ordinary student. When I hear people at Princeton talking about teaching third and fourth year courses, which are on literary Chinese, and carrying the classes on in Chinese, and there seems to be no questions about it -- well, I wonder how much better your students are than mine, whether you are thinking in terms of what you can do with outstanding students rather than in terms of what you have to do with the ordinary students. This is a very brief outline of what I see as the problems.

What the Taipei operation does now is to meet several of these problems and I think meet them quite well. There the students have sufficient exposure. When the student goes there, he goes only for a year's work on the language, spoken Chinese, to a point where he can handle spoken Chinese, read general colloquial materials with a fair degree of competence, and then go on into reading in whatever his special interest is.

The set up is such that each student is dealt with individually. The classes are almost entirely individual student tutorials. The student has four hours of class a day, or more if he wants more. When he gets to the point where he does not need that much time in class, then he has less. The situation is highly flexible.

Outside the classroom, of course, the environment is Chinese, and depending on each student's inclinations, there is ample opportunity to go on developing his competence outside the classroom. I feel that in America one of the problems in term of materials is tapes to give the student more to listen to than what he has time to hear in class; and obviously more can be done than is now done with tapes by way of practise in production. In Taiwan this is not a problem either. There is a language laboratory there and students make use of it,being encouraged rather than required to. However, the students can carry on their practice on the street just the same.

Now let me say in a few words what the Taipei Center doesn't do, but might do for us. The number one problem that I mentioned, the lack of opportunity for ample exposure in teaching language here, is met simply by the situation in the Center there. The thing that hasn't been done up to this point for us here, the feedback we have not yet had from there, is in the area of intermediate-level and advanced-level spoken language teaching materials. You have a large and very good staff for classroom work, but there hasn't been sufficient talent there to initiate and direct production of good intermediate level spoken language materials. Much has been done in production of reading materials, but nothing of spoken materials has been coming home.

The significance of this problem to each of you will depend upon how much you agree with my view of the need for these things. If you can go on confidently in a third year course and can proceed with teaching Mencius in Chinese and building up your literary Chinese courses on a base of only two years' spoken Chinese, then maybe I am wrong about what we need. I should certainly like to have some discussion of it at this point. This does at least complete a brief outline of what I see as the situation.

Mote Do you think the Taipei Center actually could be made to serve this function, if the board perhaps set them up somewhat differently? Is that the proper place to do it, in your opinion?

Dew Yes, I think it is, because you have the basic work-force, plenty of people to produce things if you have somebody to tell them what to produce.

Chao On this problem of manpower, I suppose everybody has had the experience that it is more critical to have the right approach and accent, and so on for teachers of beginners than for the more advanced students who can stand more variations of style and pronunciation. Maybe students should get used to variant styles and vocabularies fairly early.

COFFEE BREAK

Mote I think the problem Professor Dew mentioned, that of how you accommodate to wide disparities of ability and motivation, is important but one that we have basically to disregard. If you lean over too far in, for example, teaching them in English, you're only making bad students into worse students -- and you certainly don't help the good students.

The problem of the mixed class exists everywhere. You have students on all levels of interest, competence, native ability in the class and we all have to make a practical adjustment as to where we should pitch the material. It seems to me that it should be above the mid-point.

The preparation of elaborate materials giving them "crutches" in English and bairhuah translations and so on -- this is not done for the good student. They don't need it, really, the very good ones. Such materials represent a kind of compromise to keep the general pitch of your presentation as high as possible, while at the same time preserving principles we consider basic for anyone learning Chinese.

Liu: Well, I think I ought to say something on behalf of the bad student. We certainly don't have "the good student" at Minnesota. (Laughter) After all, it's a university of 40,000 and everybody who passes high school with a B average is entitled to a college education, and we draw our students from that pool.

We do use the Mandarin Primer as a text, so by the third year, when we reach classical Chinese, we can explain everything in Chinese. We also have a vermacular Chinese course, which can be taken concurrently with classical after two years of the vernacular. I think that anybody who finishes all of the Mandarin Primer would have an excellent foundation and would have a very good feel for usage and syntax. Thus I think it is not so much the quality of the student as the quality of the textbook that insures good results. So much on behalf of the bad student.

Dew Lest I be misunderstood, I don't want you to think that I don't approve of conducting the third year course of literary Chinese altogether in Chinese. I've always in fact hoped that it could be done that way. I simply remain a little skeptical about how it will work out -- that is, conducting a third-year literary Chinese course entirely in Chinese.

Mote Of course, the student also has the option of a third year course in bairhuah. We're all experimenting. I'm not suggesting that we here have any final answers; but as a clarification, I think I should point out that our situation is not significantly different from yours.

Well, not to turn this discussion but rather to continue it, I wonder if Miss Liu and Mr. Ch'en could make some comment on this new summer school which now exists at Middlebury. As you know there is a tradition at Middlebury College of having summer schools of total immersion in language, though up to now this has been limited to modern European languages. The students have to take an oath that they will not speak any English in class or out of class, day or night. There is one refuge halfway across town where they can go to get rid of their tensions, but otherwise they can be expelled from this program for being overheard speaking English in any circumstances.

They have decided now to extend this to Chinese, and it has produced a facility which I visited this summer. I was amazed to find students I had known here conversing quite fluently after six or eight weeks there, discussing quite profoundly problems of history, politics, athletics, what have you -- all the things one talks about in a day. I think we ought to know a little more about this as an addition to our arsenal of supplementary programs.

Liu I was telling Professor Ch'en at the coffee hour that I was going to "sell melons", because I really feel that the Middlebury summer institute is an example of an "open road" in the teaching of modern Chinese and also very useful as a place to test approaches and materials. We have been extremely fortunate in our staff: The first year we had Mr. Kao and Mr. P. C. Chao from here, and they prepared the classical curriculum; Mr. Mei and Miss Chou were there; and the lecture series was headed by Ho Ping-ti from Chicago and also included Yeh Chia-ying, now at Harvard; so really we had an all-star cast -- and good teachers at the same time. And we had good students too, good students from Princeton, Columbia, Harvard, George Washington. We also had some bad ones -- from the Midwest. (Laughter) But the students got a lot, that's what I want to stress.

Two aspects of the available material deserve mention: The language labs and the course structure. The second first: The first year we had a very interesting experiment -- it was something like Mrs. Pian's third-year Chinese -- except that with the environment of Middlebury it was done slightly differently and also incorporated what was mentioned earlier this morning about team teaching. This was what we called Chinese 3-4-5-6, four courses. Everybody who was taking Chinese 3, 5, or 6 must take Chinese 4, which was a lecture course completely conducted in Mandarin on Chinese history. This was actually no brain-child of mine; the idea came from Mr. Freeman at Middlebury and came out of his years of experience teaching at this kind of language school. As an illustration, we had a requirement from the Office of Education that in order to hold any NDFL fellowship we must have a course in the social sciences. So we decided to teach Chinese history in Chinese so that it would not conflict with Middlebury College's basic philosophy that all courses must be taught in Chinese.

That was really a task for Mr. Lao from the University of Washington. He had to give lectures on ancient and even prehistoric Chinese history to students who had only had two years of Chinese. They had to take notes. The third year students had individual supervised discussions afterward to check and see if they understood all the lecture. The first two weeks were very hard on everyone. Mr. Lao threatened to resign if the students wouldn't be more prepared to follow his lecture and the students were trying to commit sucide; but nothing happened and after the third week everybody went to his class quite happily.

Even the second year students were encouraged to do so. They didn't do it for credit, and it was never more than a semi-requirement, because the second year classes had a lot of other work to do -- grammar and other exercises from the text book -- and a lot of the second year students had not come particularly well prepared and needed remedial work before they could really take up the curriculum.

But my point is, after three or four weeks, even second year students went to Prof. Lao's class also. A student from Minnesota was assisting me in the office and he had the permission to attend all the classes. This student attended that whole course on Chinese History. He had had only one year of Chinese, but said later that he had really learned a great deal from it.

This framework structure is very interesting because it is really a bridge from the kind of artificial classroom Chinese situation to experiencing Chinese with content, and it would also give the students a feeling that they are getting ideas and facts, if they were interested in political science or history or any social science. They have a feeling that learning the spoken language would not be all lost. They became eager to read newspaper Chinese and documents. With a course like that, it gave them a better feeling towards learning the language and speaking it, and that opened their minds to other things.

As to the language laboratory, Middlebury had perhaps the best language lab I have ever seen anywhere. The laboratory is airconditioned but not the classroom. Also the students had complete privacy there; in fact, there was a rule against two people in the same room. (Laughter) We had requests from students, asking whether it wouldn't be all right for two of them to stay in the same booth to practise conversation; but the director of the language lab gave a firm No.

Because of that facility, I designed an additional language lab exercise. I asked Mr. Ma, who was helping me on first year Chinese, to think up some questions based upon both the vocabulary and the grammar of the lessons they were studying; and we put these questions on tape so that the students would go to the language lab with those questions and try to answer them, recording their responses on tape. Then Mr. Ma would correct the tapes afterwards.

This turned out to be quite efficient for the first year students. They went there knowing nothing at all about the language, and in ten years -- I mean ten weeks (Laughter) -- by the end of the session I gave a closing speech all in Chinese and all the first-year students could understand it. Also they were able to go and follow the lecture of Professor Yeh Chia-ying, who gave a lecture on Chinese poetry, mostly Tu Fu's poems. That was also in Chinese. The first year students of course could not be expected to understand it all, but they could follow it generally, and that was really quite a success. I don't know whether Mr. Ma was just a good teacher or whether the students were just especially bright.

At any rate, I tried the same sort of thing when I went back to Minnesota; but Minnesota doesn't have the same kind of language lab and you can't make the same sort of recording; so I modified it a little by asking the students to make their own tapes of the exercises in the Mandarin Primer. In past years I had often spent long times correcting minor defects, especially for some of the less able students; but last year's class really was far better than the one we had had before, though I don't think there was any change in the quality of students. I think this technique really helps. I understand that last summer at Ann Arbor the third-year students who had had this kind of preparation didn't have any trouble understanding spoken Chinese; but those who were from Minnesota had never had this kind of taped recording experience and they had more problems in comprehension.

The third thing about Middlebury is what Professor Mote has called the atmosphere. There was a sort of osmosis. Everyone spoke Chinese all this time and we never bother to correct them outside of class, no matter how awkward their pronunciation and grammar were. In spite of some shock at the beginning, the teachers were really very good about it: They would simply carry on conversations, regardless of how awful the students' Chinese was, as if it was perfectly clear and correct. And, you know, a person tends to become what you think he is; and by the end of the summer they had all become quite good Chinese speakers.

Ch'en As Professor Mote says, Middlebury has had long experience running these foreign language schools. What they attempt to achieve is complete concentration upon the foreign language, segregation from outside diversions and from contact with English and maximum immersion in the foreign atmosphere.

When they added the Chinese school, they tried to use the same method still. It is of course somewhat more difficult for the Chinese school to maintain conditions like the other schools, because all the others, such as French, Spanish, Italian, German and Russian, do not accept beginning students.

Obviously advanced students can carry on more meaningful daily conversations than beginners; but in Chinese they have to accept beginning students. This made things more difficult, but still the faculty and students tried hard to maintain the Middlebury tradition; and as a result the students' ability in speaking Chinese and using the language actively was greatly enhanced. I think everyone we invited to visit from other universities was impressed by it; and they wished this sort of thing could be carried on when they go back to their parent schools. Of course, they would encounter the same sort of problem as the students returned from Taiwan: Without exposure, they have no way to keep up their skill, and this is a real difficulty.

I think that, after the total immersion experience at Middlebury, students feel rather dried up when they go back to their regular institutions.

Mei I think there are a few lessons to be drawn from the Middlebury experience. One is that on the basis of Middlebury's other programs in French, Spanish, German and so on, their assumption is what can be done in these languages can also be done in Chinese. Thus Chinese is not an exotic language, although Chinese is harder than some. I remember a chart hanging in the Institute of Far Eastern Languages at Yale, showing that it took a year or two to master French and German; but for Chinese it took three or four years. But still I think the problem is the same. Therefore, if in the other languages, after the second year, all courses are taught in the native language, it must be possible to do it in Chinese. Miss Liu also mentioned the fact that there instructors threatening to resign and students attempting suicide. I think this is one of the professional hazards in Chinese studies. (Laughter)

But I do think after two or three weeks the students, perhaps brainwashed or tamed, can channel their energies more into the language learning rather than thinking up ways of getting out of it. Language learning experiences do cause frustration, and this is unavoidable.

I think one of the reasons why Princeton, with its mixed student body, can teach Chinese with such impressive results is that they have an integrated, coherent, and uniform language policy. As Miss Liu says, the student becomes what you think he can become.

The last thing I want to say is: In Middlebury it is a highly artificial environment. You take an English-speaking environment in the Vermont countryside and then make an artifical environment in which only the native languages can be spoken. Perhaps in the Taiwan Center, which is a native and actual environment, in which everybody around speaks Chinese that something can be done there naturally which is artificial in Middlebury.

Kierman The Foreign Service Institute claims that, from a standing start, they can educate a foreign service officer to speak usable French, so that he can function as a counselor or political officer, in nine months. They regard the two most difficult languages as Chinese and Arabic, which would take 14 months in their system.

On the other idea, that of brainwashing, the Berlitz system really is purposeful brainwashing. The idea is as soon as possible on any given day to bring the student to such a degree of exhaustion that he is highly suggestible. So what they do is run relays of instructors to pound at them in a definite effort to adopt brainwashing techniques so as to submerge resistance.

Bodman I'm sorry to contradict you -- and of course my experience in the FSI was ten years ago -- but at that time, Chinese took three years, and they didn't get any wenyan, either. I believe that recently, with the Taichung school, they've been getting better results through spending less time in Washington.*

Hanan I should like to take up Mr. Mei's point that this admirable feature of the Middlebury program could be done as well, considerably better, in Taiwan. I wonder whether it wouldn't be possible to have a summer program for American students who have already studied some Chinese in Taiwan on the model of the Russian Program under which a good many students go for the USSR every summer. I don't think this would really be too expensive; but in any case all summer programs are terribly expensive already. Perhaps summer would not be everyone's choice of time to go there, but I'm sure good results could be achieved.

* Later check with FSI disclosed that standard cruising time now, with about 6 or 12 months in Washington and 18 or 12 in Taiwan, is in fact 24 months, following which they do regard graduates as capable of carrying on normal duties in speaking and reading Chinese.

Pian We have been thinking about summer school in terms of busy students who don't have time to prepare language background in the regular school year, and also for those who want to fulfill language requirements in a hurry. I wonder though if it might not work out better if one enrolled students who have had one full year of intensive Chinese. Maybe then summer school could better be used by reviewing what they have already learned. During the regular school year, it is always possible that students do not have time to really digest and assimilate the materials learned in class. Perhaps in summer school they could be given expanded materials on the same level.

But the thing I wondered is: If Middlebury summer School can get such results by using these techniques, why can't we do the same thing in regular term time?

Mote Well, Middlebury itself doesn't do that with its regular college language courses.

Shih Oh, they don't have general language programs?

Mote They do, but they can't maintain that regulation which forbids the use of any language other than the one you're studying. So that kind of total immersion can't be used.

They do carry on seminars in the languages of their culture, but they can't restrict students all the day round -- you can't, for example, find physics or chemistry teachers who can work in French.

Stimson It may be interesting to see what emerges in England where four or five major universities are in a sense shunting their students into a full time intensive Chinese training program before they ever start anything else in Chinese.

Kratochvil Yes, there are some preparations going on for this, but nobody knows whether it will in fact emerge. It is based on the rather peculiar situation in England, where the secondary school year is from December to December, while the university year is from October to June. So that when kids come out of school, they have about eight months of doing nothing before they to to the university. The idea was to provide this sort of school which could also serve other purposes, or preparation for those who want to read Chinese on the university level. It could be a sort of eight-month course which could more or less substitute for the sort of language training the students normally do in the first year at the university.

Like the other programs that have been suggested, this is of course intended to make the job on the university level easier, since most courses at British universities -- theoretically, at least -- last only three years. London and Leeds are exceptions, but most are calculated as lasting three years; and of course if you have to spend a lot of your time on elementary language learning, you don't really get very far in three years, and it also takes time away from other things.

Of course England is a small country. It should certainly be possible to organize some special program of this kind.

Bodman Harriet Mills had an idea two or three years ago, though it was never carried out, of having one academic year plus a summer just for training in Chinese language. This is primarily for graduate students in various departments who need the language as a tool for their work. By this means the majority of their tool work could be finished, not necessarily sinologists, in the first year, during which they are expected to learn roughly the equivalent of three years.

Chao How does that compare with the Middlebury program?

Bodman This would be for the whole year, not just a summer.

Mei The policy at Yale is that, if a student is admitted to the graduate school with inadequate language preparation, he spends his full year just working on his Chinese. This does not count as a year of residence, and he does not get formal credit towards his course of study. My point is that, since this rule is applied for all graduate students on a uniform basis, it may furnish a model which other institutions can use.

Mote I understand that the University of Washington has a fifteen-hour course in Chinese, most of it just on language; this has been experimented with in an American university, but it hasn't caught on.

Wrenn There is a general difficulty about when to teach what. There is also a particular problem that graduate students, in my experience, are never -- or rarely -- as good as undergraduates in the same institution, in the beginning-level courses. They have a tremendous pressure for performance. Nearly always they're expected to do better than undergraduates, but they rarely do as well. We end up either playing games with them or treating them as if they were a separate class of student -- not marking them on the same scale. Another problem, if you're not in a discipline-oriented department, is that a beginning graduate student who comes in with a language deficiency -- and if it isn't made up, as it was at Yale -- is in rather a special sort of spot: He has to convince his discipline department that he is an able scholar or at least potentially so, otherwise he isn't likely to hold onto the fellowship he needs. This means that he spends less of his time on language than he perhaps needs to. Thus, unless he is somehow let off the hook -- that is, made to make up the language deficiency as they did at Yale or by taking a year off in Taiwan -- you don't get the results you want out of that first-year graduate student.

Mote I haven't heard anybody boasting that he has solved this tangled problem yet. We have very serious problems in this whole field of Chinese studies; and if we do nothing else this morning than remind ourselves again that this is serious difficulty and that we haven't found all the answers yet, we will have done something useful if perhaps not cheering. Professor Chao, do you have any comment?

Chao In that first Army language program at Harvard, they were supposed to spend 60% of their time on language and the rest on history, culture, and so on; but in fact they spent much more than 60% on language. Still, after nine months -- to be sure, they didn't get characters, or weren't _required_ to learn them, and there was no _wenyan_; but by that time most of the GI's could speak on practically any topic fluently.

Not only that, but after only a couple months of Cantonese, they ended up by putting on a play in Chinese. Some suggested that the reason for this rapid progress was a strong motivation: They thought that if they didn't do well, they would have to go back to doing KP work. (Laughter) Nevertheless, whatever the reasons were, it does give an idea of what can be done with intensive courses.

Dien
Professor Chao, weren't you involved in an intensive course at Berkeley, too?

Chao
That was at the university extension. It was intensive, to be sure, but it was off the main track -- the students were of widely varying kinds, from all walks of life, and were perhaps not so serious as those taking regular courses.

Mote
I think there's no doubt that we have enough experience to show we can teach Chinese rapidly and well through intensive methods. How much we can combine this with life in the university and how to fit it into the student's regular program and particularly how we can follow up on things like skills learned in the spoken language -- students coming back from Taiwan must not forget their vocabulary in six months and start to slip on their tones in a year -- we must work on the active use of the language while serving other academic ends, this is something we really must devise some formula to handle before we can be satisfied we are doing our job.

Perhaps there is a gleam of hope in Stockholm, on this front?

Malmqvist
No. (Laughter)

Mote
What about in Paris?

Ruhlmann
One experiment started last year, a summer school for one month, half private and half government-sponsored. They had language labs during the morning and two hours of class in the afternoon; but they should have that Middlebury oath. (Laughter) Much of the time, of course, they were speaking French, and this was not to the point.

I would be interested to hear details from anybody who has been involved in the Seattle experiment.

Gillooly
I was at Seattle, but I really don't know much about it. It has been tried for a few years with Japanese, and that set the model for the Chinese program. They have been very much pleased with the results in Japanese, which advanced on a broad front so that the student is able to read and write and speak. I think that's the emphasis for such an intensive program.

Ruhlmann
Are most of the students undergraduate?

Gillooly
Well, Seattle is one of the places which will accept graduate students who have no prior training in Chinese or Japanese. So I think maybe at Seattle there are more graduate students in beginning intensive courses than there would be at other universities. I should say that my experience at

Seattle rather goes against Professor Wrenn's representation that the graduate students were worse. Some 32 or 33 students started with the class I was in, in 1961; but finishing that first year of intensive Chinese there were only nine, seven of them graduate students and only two undergraduates. Whereas I think three or four of the dropouts were,all the rest were undergraduates.

Stimson (?) It still sounds as if the undergraduates are smarter. (Laughter)

Liu Maybe I had a wild dream last year; and it occurs to me this may be the time to communicate that wild dream -- of bringing Middlebury to different campuses. I think it is possible, if we can get the money, to build a building which is a sort of conditioning environment. With audio-visual aids, you can create a situation: You walk into a room that is Peking; you can see Mao Tse-tung and the Red Guards with their little red book. Or you can walk into another room and see the Empress Dowager; or you can program a different, more distant time -- the Ming dynasty or the Sung. Why not? With all the technical aids we have as we move towards the 21st Century, we should make use of such capabilities. This way the student could go in there any time he likes; and if you have something that attractive, they will go. Then they wouldn't have to go to Taiwan or anywhere.

Mote We had an idea here too, and it doesn't involve the need of speaking Ming Chinese. We wanted to create a China eating club here, bring a good cook or two to town. (Laughter) Seduce students in this way to eat in Chinese and live in the atmosphere.

Shih At Pomona College they emphasize humanities and also language training. Just as I was leaving, they were completing a building with a wing which they called the Chinese Wing. This housed all the students who wanted to learn Chinese; and they had a native speaker living there, whose duty was simply to speak with them in the native tongue. I got them a person who had done radio broadcasting in Taiwan and who was quite good. Then they have by telephone wire tied a tape recording from the laboratory, which is several blocks away, to the dormitory and through electronic devices students have available 24-hour a day program tapes. We gave a list of programs to the lab attendant to be played each week according to the lesson. The students could push buttons in their rooms and have the tape repeated to them, a type of brainwashing. (Laughter) In a small college they can do this.

Mote Well, it is now probably time for me to express our gratitude to all of you for having come here and participated so intelligently and so constructively in this conference. I told you at the beginning that I wasn't sure what would happen. I am more than pleased at what has happened. I hope it has been as interesting to you as it has been useful to us. If we succeed in having another conference next year, we hope to see many of you again then.

INDEX TO SECOND LINGUISTICS CONFERENCE

(NOTE: Speakers are listed alphabetically, subjects they spoke about chronologically.)

- Chao Yuen-ren
  - Distinctions between *bairhuah* and *wenyan* compounds 19
  - Mathews Dictionary, background 21
  - Obvious items, include in dictionary 21,25
  - Illustration vs. categorization 26
  - Compounds, comprehension vs. composition 29
  - *Wenyan* can be taught in either *bairhuah* or *wenyan* 45
  - Structural translation, *wenyan* to *bairhuah* 52
  - Audio-lingual approach 66,67

- Ch'en, Leo
  - Modern *wenyan*, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and such 63

- Ch'en Ta-tuan
  - Princeton procedures in teaching classical Chinese 49
  - *Bairhuah* as a means of teaching classical Chinese 67
  - Middlebury summer school 79

- Dew, James
  - Taipei Center 73-75

- Dien, Albert
  - Free or controlled texts, dictionary 24

- Edgren, Sören
  - Students' needs from a dictionary 27
  - Literary vs. colloquial, possibly two dictionaries 31

- Ellegiers, Daniel
  - Explaining grammatical formulas to students 48
  - Mullie's grammar and chart 56

- Gillooly, Peter
  - Seattle intensive Chinese course 83

- Gould, Sidney
  - Latin-French-Chinese, comparison difficult 62

- Hanan, Patrick
  - Taiwan for summer program 80

- Kao Yu-kung
  - KTHY, its *bairhuah* notes very simple 44
  - Princeton approach to classical Chinese 57
  - *Fifty Chinese Stories* 63
  - Rapid reading of classics 66

Kierman, Frank
  Entries, a few extensive but most sparse 28
  Gradual abandonment of aids in texts 60

Kratochvil, Paul
  Frame of reference, dangers in 22
  Translating dictionaries 25
  Categorize where possible, otherwise illustrate 28
  Wang Li, ideology and grammatical framework 46,50
  British plan for intensive Chinese training 81

Liu Chun-jo
  Early speaking, adapted to wenyan teaching 54
  Bad students, defense of 76
  Middlebury summer school 77-79

Malmqvist, Göran
  Asian dictionaries, need for transition to 21
  KTHY, list of errors 37
    " , alternative collections 43
    " , explanations not always best available 45
  Two good Chinese grammars, should be translated 47
  Variant translations, use in teaching 62
  Background needed for studying classical Chinese 65

McCoy, John
  Bairhuah notes, how difficult? 44

Mei Tsu-lin
  Translating Han-yü tz'u-tien 23
  Teaching vs. analyzing classical grammar 49
  Princeton-Harvard procedures and tests 53
  Deciphering, discouragement of it 65
  Reading loads and speed-reading 72
  Middlebury summer school 79
  Graduate students with inadequate language 82

Mote, Frederick
  Characters of highest utility 25
  KTHY, description 34
    " , use as textbook 38-43
  Supplementary teaching materials 38
  Fifty Chinese Stories 39,55
  Sample materials for teaching classical Chinese 55
  Good and bad students, mixed classes 75

Norman, Jerry
  Dictionary entries, analysis of samples 16-18
  Old Chinese phonetic features 63

Pian, Rulan C.
- Harvard third-year course 69-71
- Summer school for review 81

Rickett, Allyn
- Psychological problems in approaching classical texts 51
- Independent analytical ability, encouraging it 59

Ruhlmann, Robert
- Inner dictionary of most common words 32
- Forty pages of grammar out of Wang Li 48
- French intensive Chinese course 83

Shih Chung-wen
- Workshop for teachers of classical Chinese 54
- Reading speed and class load 73
- Chinese Wing at Pomona, language lab 84

Stimson, Hugh
- Phonological information in entries 20
- What sort of dictionary? 26

Wrenn, James
- Mixture of bairhuah and wenyan styles, how difficult? 45
- Linguistic terms, Gleason on 47
- Graduate students worse than undergraduates 82

Yang Lien-sheng
- Dictionary entry, added comment 19
- Phonological information in entries 20
- Need for good classical dictionary, Couvreur 31
- KTHY, criticisms and use of it 35-37

ATTACHMENT A

Frederick W. Mote
Princeton University

A Students' Vocabulary Handbook of Chinese: A statement of purposes and of suggestions about the focus of the forthcoming conference discussions

The planners of the 1967 Princeton Conference on Chinese Linguistics have failed to clarify their intention in placing this item (referred to previously as a "dictionary") on the agenda for the afternoon of October 10. Within the staff of the Chinese Linguistics Project, the idea of the projected word book has acquired rather specific definition, and it reflects a failure of perspective on their part that they have not better anticipated the need of others, outside the Project, to be informed more specifically about their intended definition of the problem.

Several of the invited conferees have responded to our request for sample entries with quite reasonable queries and doubts, reflecting at least our failure of communication, and perhaps, more seriously, inadequacy of the conception itself. We hope the following points will clarify some of the issues, and lead to constructive and well-focussed discussions on October 10.

I. The "dictionary" is to be a students' glossary, to serve the language learner as a repository of information about Chinese characters and words, but only the information which he really needs as a student (information which he may be held responsible for digesting and assimilating?), and only that relevant to the limited number of characters of highest utility to him at that learner's level. Hence our present shift to the more modest name of "vocabulary handbook." To further define that level, it should include perhaps the 2nd through the 4th or 5th years of his formal study of Chinese, or from the point at which the student begins to use such a dictionary to that point at which he can make the transition to more or less full reliance on reference works designed for the native user of the language. When a student can, for example, rely on his *Hannyeu tsydean* 漢語詞典 for routine reference, and use the *Peywen yunnfuu* 佩文韻府 on his own as necessary, he is no longer the object of our concern in compiling this vocabulary handbook.

We therefore assume that the student will begin to use this after one year of Chinese study, and will gladly abandon it after his 4th or 5th year at the latest. But during that learning time, it should function, (as no existing dictionary known to us at present functions) to:

a. Answer quickly the questions about pronunciation, grammatical function, meaning, and usage that the student is most likely to ask in the course of language study and reading;

b. Simultaneously, train him in the use of or at least prepare him for the transition to more mature dictionaries and reference works;

c. Anticipate the scope of his needs throughout learning phases, from intermediate to advanced, that can be assumed to engage him primarily with MVL (modern vernacular literature Chinese), modern academic, newspaper and documentary and other recent styles, as well as the types of classical Chinese that he will encounter in the projected 4-course beginning and intermediate classical based on the Guuday Hannyeu 古代漢語.

d. Serve as an adjunct to an integrated body of teaching materials designed to confrom to a consistent linguistic approach and philosophy of language learning, and to complement those in a way which will reduce overlapping and redundancy to a minimum;

e. Encourage the development of the intuitive capacity by which he extends what is known to what is unknown but which can be grasped by analogy and guided imagination;

f. By embodying in one book the irreducible core of the basic character and word learning task, to help to define that task, to set uniform standards for judging achievement, and to serve as one kind of standard against which to plan the phases of that learning task.

II. Acceptance of these purposes implies a definite limitation on the scope of this learning tool. It also places certain general issues of lexicology beyond the scope of the discussions we hope to conduct on October 10. To explain further by reference to some specific issues:

a. Size of the basic lexicon. Between his second and fifth years of Chinese language study the student, depending on the intensiveness and the goals of his study, can be expected to enlarge his vocabulary of simple characters from about 600 (after one year) to a minimum of 3,000. The latter figure may well be only one-half or one-third of the level reached by many students. But after learning perhaps 3,000 characters of highest utility in a body of material that most students will be exposed to regardless of their ultimate learning goals, it is probable that individual differentiation of study specialization and interest will make it difficult to find another 2,000-3,000 characters with a very high degree of common utility to all, and still harder to gloss them in a manner that will meet common needs. This supposition is open to testing, and tests of it are planned, but for the time being we are led to accept it. Hence we presently intend to limit this students' vocabulary handbook to about 2,500-3,500 single characters which in fact have the highest utility in MVL and in the forms of classical Chinese that the student will encounter at this stage, and to make these single characters the headings under which all of the information will be entered. In fact, there is a strongly held opinion among some members of the staff that no more than 1,500 characters should be included and that the emphasis should be on more exhaustive functional analysis of a small number of words. This issue of size remains to be considered further, lower and upper limits of 1,500 and 3,500 can be used for present discussions.

The methods of determining "highest utility" include objective measuring of frequency of occurrence in the types of materials assumed to be the objects of students' study at this stage, as well as some subjective judgement about words and characters selected according to different criteria. A computer analysis of very extensive bodies of text is an example of the former; Wang Li's Charng-yong tsyr 常用詞 in the Guuday Hannyeu is an example of the latter. Both these have their merits, but the results of each should be indicated clearly in the projected work, inasmuch as its scope is to be determined by such disparate criteria of selection. That is, to create an imaginary example which probably anticipates our intended working method, for all single characters the number of their place in a listing according to frequency of occurrence in a particular body of material should be indicated; if it is found in Wang Li's list of about 1,000 characters, that also will be indicated; and other information showing the relationship of characters to these or other standard lists also should be included.

In short, the Princeton staff have done considerable investigation of this problem and have come to some fairly concrete conclusions on most issues, but they would very much appreciate the opportunity to modify these on the basis of conference discussions.

b. Scope of Glossing. Not all of the widespread dissatisfaction with existing Chinese-English dictionaries can be overcome in any one new dictionary, nor should the present work even attempt to do so. One experienced teacher has noted that "no dictionary contains enough titles and proper nouns," that the new Yale dictionary may be "too bulky to ever get carried into a classroom," and that the Chao-Yang Concise Dictionary contains "too few compounds." The faults of Matthews could not even be listed, and none of the handy dictionaries is "up to date."

There are reasons to believe that no single dictionary can aim to serve widely diverse needs. For example, the student very often needs good accurate translations of titles encountered in reading, but the historian will note that the same title usually cannot be translated in one way for all of its uses throughout history, and that studies accepted as authoritative for single dynastic periods are few. Hence these are better left to glosses on particular passages in prepared reading materials. But should the elements often used in titles be indicated in some way, to put the student on notice to look for such a meaning?

The Chao-Yang dictionary can be considered to be highly authoritative on pronunciation and accurately analytical with regard to functions of words and levels of usage; can these virtues be extended to a dictionary designed to answer the broader reading needs of 3rd-5th year students?

Can meanings of characters be arranged (either with semasiological certitude or merely for mnemonic effectiveness, or both) so as to suggest semantic relationships among different categories of meaning? Assuming that we cannot conduct enough semantic and historical research to solve many problems, can we then utilize existing knowledge in ways that will improve the arrangement as well as the content of entries?

Can multiple-character entries be arranged and grouped so as to illustrate probabilities of meaning, thereby encouraging students to extend their knowledge "naturally" by analogy and intuition, and thereby also to diminish the need for this handbook to attempt exhaustiveness? Do we know enough about how people learn to guide this aspect of dictionary design? I.e., if jenq-jyh 政治 is entered under jenq 政, need such items as jenq-chyuan 政權, jenq daang 政黨, jenq-jyh dih-lii 政治地理, also be included? Where should the line be drawn to make the dictionary useful without becoming too bulky?

It is assumed that distinct colloquial, MVL, or classical usages, and their implications for grammar, should be indicated. Do we know enough about the often overlapping levels of language to indicate these aspects of word-definition and grammatical functions with greater accuracy and usefulness than has previously been done? All new dictionaries cannibalize their predecessors to some extent. Can this problem be readily solved by that method?

In considering the foregoing and other such questions, please keep in mind the fact that in the minds of the Linguistic Project staff, the distinctive functional feature of the dictionary is that for all items included it will give such information that those characters will seldom if ever have to be explained further (and certainly will not need to be explained repetitiously) as they occur in the teaching materials coordinated with the glossary in which the student does his formal language learning. Since we expect that the characters included in the dictionary will account for 90% or more of any body of running text that the student (or the mature scholar) will ever encounter, removing at one blow all the need to gloss these for the student will greatly simplify the preparation of teaching materials coordinated with it. [The outstanding . exception will be the occurrences of these single characters in titles and proper nouns; many of these will probably have to be glossed as they occur.]

c. *Arrangement and form of entries*. Since the dictionary is to be an integral part of a set of teaching materials all of which: 1) use G. R. romanization as a basic learning tool; and 2) assume that spoken Chinese will be the actively-employed medium of instruction throughout, G. R. will provide the primary form of pronunciations, and modern standard colloquial pronunciations will be given precedence over other kinds of alternate readings.

Does this then lead to the conclusion that arrangement according to sound should be followed, or is the radical system or some other based on the graphs more useful to the student? If sound rules over form, should the sequence be determined by the alphabet, or by that of the National Phonetic Symbols 注音符號 ?

Accepting the broad usefulness, or at least, the wide spread use of Wade-Giles, Yale romanization, *Hàn-yǔ pīn-yīn*, the National Phonetic Symbols, and perhaps some other ways of indicating pronunciation at least as secondary systems, these will also have to be included. Can this be done in a format that will make the dictionary almost as readily usable by a person who knows one of these others and not G. R.?

A standard typeface should be employed, and recently standardized mainland simplified forms also must be included. Should standard typeface variant forms current in Japan also be included? Should handwriting variants of kae-shu 楷書 forms be indicated, or perhaps other handwritten examples of all characters? We can safely assume that archaic Chinese forms, seal characters, etc., need not clutter up this dictionary, but where does the inclusion of variants reach the point of diminishing returns to the student?

d. Appendices and Indices. What kinds of further information should be entered in a students' dictionary. (Four-corner system numbers? Morohashi or Giles numbers? Others?) Should the dictionary attempt to become a supplementary handbook, or should it remain primarily a glossary of the basic vocabulary of the highest frequency and general utility?

e. What features of format should be considered? What dictionaries of any language have helpful features which could be included in a students' dictionary of Chinese?

III. The proposed dictionary probably will be the first to embody the results of a computer-derived objective frequency analysis, and this should impart certain value to it. As a study of MVL, its value could be further enhanced by publishing in an appendix the full table of frequencies of the entire million-word sample. Should other such analyses of lexicon be included in appendices, for comparative purposes?

What else can be done, within practical limits, to lend this work linguistic and pedagogic distinction? We are convinced that its preparation is worth the effort, for its use as part of an integrated body of teaching materials; how else can its value and usefulness as an independent product be enhanced?

ATTACHMENT B

by Pavel Kratochvil
Institute of Oriental Studies
Cambridge University

It is, in my opinion, unwise to attempt at compiling a bilingual dictionary of any kind (or even designing a single sample entry, for that matter) without first making up one's mind about a number of issues among which the following four are perhaps of the greatest importance:

1) Precisely what purpose should the dictionary serve and by whom is it meant to be used. 'A student' is perhaps not enough: what kind of a student, of precisely what? Beside other things, a decision in this respect is essential for delimiting the number of basic lexical items, their choice, and the internal build-up of individual entries.

2) Precisely what frame of reference should the dictionary be based upon. By this I am primarily hinting at questions of historical and stylistic coverage. In view of the rather unfortunate tradition of large Chinese-English dictionaries most of which represent a disorganized and disproportionate mixture of historical levels and styles whose only unifying element is the basically irrelevant morphemic script, it is perhaps superfluous to elaborate on the importance of this particular point.

3) What existing relevant works should be taken into account. Beside existing dictionaries similar to that which is intended, it is imperative to take into consideration relevant monolingual dictionaries of a normative nature. To give a rather extreme example, anyone wishing to compile a (Modern Standard) English-German dictionary could not really hope to get far without taking into account one of the variants of the Oxford Dictionary and the norm it reflects. In the case of dictionaries based on Chinese as the first language, the lack of a, so to speak, officially established norm does not mean that the compiler can afford to disregard the normative trends present in the Chinese linguistic community at any point of time.

4) What general principles regarding the possibility and ways of finding equivalents in the sphere of lexical items should be adopted in the given case. Disregarding one of the two extreme standpoints one could take, namely that translation is not a feasible feat by definition (i.e. a Sapir-Whorf-like definition), and that languages are largely equivalent in terms of reflected universals, I think it is essential to specify one's position somewhere between these two extremes and apply this position systematically in the practice of compiling the given dictionary.

Such items as those listed under a-e in your letter are, in my opinion, largely matters of secondary order where the decision or choice can only logically follow from decisions to the primary issues. I think that preoccupation with technicalities and issues of secondary order together with considerable lack of motivation and theoretical principles, as well as a kind of amateurish trial-and-error attitude towards dictionary making, have been mainly responsible for the present unsatisfactory state in the respect of Chinese-English dictionaries, and if the discussion at the coming conference is hoped to lead to something better, it should be directed towards primary problems in the first place. I am not suggesting that questions of the forms of characters, romanization, etc., are unimportant, but I should like to stress that, in my opinion, there are no universal solutions to these questions, and that they can be profitably discussed only in relation to what I think are the basic underlying issues in any dictionary project.

ATTACHMENT C

Prof. L. S. Yang
Harvard University

書 (ㄕㄨ) shu (shu^1)

to write; to write (characters, a letter, etc.) 書寫 ; to record (as history)

writing; the Book of History or Book of Documents 書經，尚書 ;

a history, as (前)漢書 History of the (Former) Han Dynasty [or rarely parts of a history as 八書 "the Eight Treatises" of 史紀 (corresponding to 志 in other histories) or 魏書 (or 魏志) as part of 三國志];

a book 書籍 ; a document 文書 , as 申請書 "an application"; a letter 書信 ; a memorial, as 萬言書 "memorial of 10,000 words"; a story as 說書 "story-telling" 無巧不成書 "Happy accidents make a story" (Cf. 說話 and 無巧不成話)

script, as 六書 "the Six Scripts or Six Principles of character-formation);

style of script, as 篆書 "seal characters."

calligraphy, as 書畫 "calligraphy and painting" [Note that 書法 may mean either "principle of (historical) recording" or "calligraphy, or the way of handling one's writing brush."]

僅 jiin (chin^3)

a little, a few [also rarely written 堇 , as (漢書地理志) 堇堇 "a little"]

only, merely, as 僅有 "there is only"; barely, as 僅以身免 "barely escaped with oneself"

almost, nearly [most commonly used in T'ang and Sung times] as (杜詩) 山城僅百層 "the castle on the mountain has nearly 100 stories."

節，節 (ㄐㄧㄝˊ) jye (chieh^2)

joint, knot (of bamboo, other plants, bones, etc.) 關節 [also in the sense of "key"]; section, verse, chapter 章節，段節 ; divisions of time, season, festival 季節 as 三大節 "the Three Major Festivals, the New Year, the 5th Day of the 5th Moon and the 15th Day of the 8th Moon, 双十節 "the Double 10th," 二十四節氣 "the 24 Divisions of the Yea an imperial birthday 聖節 ; matter, occasion, as 大節，小節 "major or minor occasions;" principle, chastity, integrity 節操，名節 as 守節 "to stick to one's principle, to remain chaste (esp. for a widow)"; tally, credentials (for an envoy, etc.) 符節，使節 , standard, (flag) token (of rank, honor, authority) 節旄，旌節 ; rhythm, beat 節奏 [also a baton or an instrument for beating time]; proper order, degree, or timing 禮節

proper or appropriate in order, degree, or timing 適節

to regulate, to control, to be temperate in 節制，節度 ; to reduce

to delete 刪節 [as 節本 "an abridged version"], to economize 節儉，節省 ;

[one of the 64 Double Trigrams ䷻]

[capitals of pillers (禮，明堂位；論語) 山節藻梲] rare.

[lofty (詩) 節彼南山] obs.

ATTACHMENT D

by Hugh M. Stimson
Yale University

73.6 書 shu shiu [śi̯wo]

1. WRITE

子張○諸紳 Tzyy-jang shu ju shen. Tzyy-jang wrote it on his sash. LY 15.5

2. SOMETHING WRITTEN

2.1 CONNECTED TEXT

畏此簡書 wey tsyy-jean-shu fear this bamboo-slip document Shy 168.4

葵丘之會，諸侯束牲載○，而不歃血 Kwei-chiou-jy-huey, ju-hour shuh sheng dzay shu, erl bu-shah sheue. At the Kwei-chiou conference, the feudatories bound the sacrificial animal and put the text [of the agreement] on its back, but they did not smear their mouths with [the animal's] blood. Menq 6b.7

MP 一本(冊)○ i-been (-tseh) shu a book (as a concrete object); 一套○ i-taw shu a set of books; 一部○ i-buh shu a book (as a work)

晉叔向使貽子產○ Jinn-Shu-shianq shyy-yi Tzyy-chaan shu. Shu-shianq of Jinn sent a letter to Tzyy-chaan. Tz Jaw.6

尚○ Shanq-shu 'Documents of Antiquity'; ○經 Shu-jing 'Book of Documents'

○云：孝乎惟孝 Shu yun: shiaw hu wei shiaw. The 'Book of Documents' says: Filial piety is just filial piety. LY 2.21

2.2 WRITTEN SHAPE

PC 六 ○ liow-shu the six ways Chinese characters are constructed

PC 四體○法 syh-tii-shu-faa the four ways of writing Chinese characters

NB: Earliest pre-Chyn meanings unmarked; MP means Modern Peking; PC means post-Classical (post-Chyn)

ATTACHMENT E

Sample entry for students' dictionary

by F. W. Mote

書，ㄕㄨ 73 曰 + 6 : 4c$^{\#}$5060$_1$

Shu PY shū; W-G Shu^1; Y Shū (no alt. pronunciation)

MVL freq.$^{\#}$ __________ ; CYT$^{\#}$ 120, p 141;

(1) book [chiefly coll., F]. 一本書 ibeen shu; 一部書 ibuh shu (and, some matters associable with books and learning).

書籍	shujyi, 書卷 shujiuann, books, generic, as publications
書記	shujih " " [cf (2)]
書本	shubeen, books, generic, as objects
書皮	shupyi (-pyel), the cover or binding of a book
書目	shumuh, catalog, or list of books, as in a library
書店	shudiann, 書鋪 [舖], shupuh, 書肆 shusyh (L), book store
書齋	shujai, 書房 shufarng, a study, the latter also means a private school (trad.)
書院	shuyuann, private academy of higher learning (trad.)
書生	shu.sheng, a youth who studies, a scholar; also, cynically, a literate person who lacks common sense

書香 shushiang, 書卷氣 shujiuann chih, the atmosphere, the attitude, of learning

(2) To record; to write down [L. in most usages].

書寫 shushiee, to write, with brush or pen (i.e. not with typewriter, or by non-manual means)

書記 shu.jih, a secretary, recording clerk [cf. (1)]

書不盡言 shu bu jinn yan, [Book of Changes], commonly "(my) written words cannot fully express (my mentally spoken) words" -- formula used to conclude letters

書法 shufaa (cf. 筆法 biifaa), historiographical (or literary) technique [cf. (3)]

(3) to write; to write artistically (L; 寫 shiee normally pref. in coll.)

書法 shufaa, calligraphy, as an art or skill

書籍 shuji, calligraphy, as object

(4) Letter, correspondence (L; 信 shinn normally pref. in coll.)

書信 shushinn, 書函 shuharn, 書柬 shujean, 書札 shujar, etc., are generic terms for letters and such written communications

(5) Forms or historic styles of Chinese characters (L)

六書 liow shu "the six forms of characters"

書體 shutii (cf. 字體 tzyhtii), the form of characters

(6) The Book of Documents (or, Classic of History) is called 書shu (L); this is an abbreviation of Shanq Shu 尚書, more popularly Shu Jing書經 .

N.B.: Possibilities for misunderstanding the sense intended from the several listed above are relatively great. Note, for example, that 書畫 shuhuah means "calligraphy and painting" (cf. 字畫 tzyhhuah), but 圖書 twushu means "pictures (maps, etc.) and books" in the sense of the items making up a library collection. 詩書 shyshu however means the two cannonical works, the Shyjing and the Shanq shu 詩經尚書, not just poetry and books, still less "books of poetry." 文書 wenshu may mean certain types of documents, but usually means a clerk, etc., etc.

* * * * *

Abbreviations and signs:

73 曰 + 6 = Radical number 73, plus 6 strokes

PY = Han yu pin yin

W-G = Wade-Giles romanization

Y = Yale romanization

MVL freq.# ----- = number of this character in list arranged according to frequency of occurrence in computer sample of MVL; see list in appendix

CYT#________ = Number assigned character, and page on which it occurs in Wang Li's selection of Charng-yonq tsyr 常用詞 of classical Chinese in Guuday hannyeu.

4c# = Four-corner system number

L = Literary, or classical Chinese

trad. = traditional usage or an aspect of traditional culture; the term not now current except in ref. to past

pref. = preferred

F = free word; B = bound word

. = neutral tone follows, normally or necessarity.

o = neutral tone may follow, optionally

Comment: The arrangement is intended to be analytical, for didactic purposes, not exhaustive. However, this arrangement, by separating into meaning and function categories, reduces speed and convenience in use. But this is a compromise made intentionally, and it may incidentally induce the student to hasten his progress to Chinese dictionaries like the *Hannyeu Tsyrdean*. Grammatical function is not indicated adequately in this sample, but it will be indicated more completely and correctly in the final form of the work, as methods of doing this are investigated further.

ATTACHMENT F

Prof. Shih Chung-wen
George Washington University

書 (SHU$_1$) n. Book, writing. (m. 本 ben, 冊 ts'e, copy; 卷 chüan, volume).
书 -- v. To write.

5	書札	letter
	書生	student
	書目	catalogue of books; index to a book
	書冊	book
7	書局	book-shop
8	書法	calligraphy
	書房	library or study
9	書香	literary fame
	書香之家	literary family
	書信	letter; correspondence
	書契	contracts; deeds; documents
	書架子	book shelves
10	書庫	library stacks
	書記	secretary
14	書獃子	bookworm
15	書寫	to write
16	書館	library or study
	書據	documentary proofs
17	書齋	library or study
19	書簽	bookmark; label on a book
20	書籍	books
4	文書	official dispatch
	手書	that is in one's handwriting
6	休書	bill of divorce

6	行書	correspondence style of handwriting
9	背書	to recite from memory
10	草書	the free running style of handwriting
	家書	letter from home
	秘書	secretary
13	楷書	the orthodox style of Chinese writing
14	說書的	story-teller using oral method
17	隸書	the square, ornamental style of Chinese writing
11	教科書	textbook
14	請願書	petition
19	證明書	documentary proof

- end -

Abbreviations used:

m	Measure word
n	Noun
v	Verb

For listing of combinations, see Item III, 2 below

Sample DictionaryEntry for the character *shu* to illustrate the following:

I. Form of Character used.

1. *Kai-shu* 楷書 the orthodox style of Chinese writing

2. *Chien-tzu* 簡字 , because of its adoption in Mainland China publications

II. Romanization System to be included

1. Wade-Giles, because of its popular use in publications in the West

2. National Romanization (*Gwoyeu Romatzyh*), because of its being the most scientific way of spelling and its familiarity to a certain number of students learning Chinese in the West

3. Yale, because of its popular use in the West among students learning Chinese

An alternative would be to list only Wade-Giles and then include a table for cross reference, containing National Romanization, Yale, and Mainland systems.

III. Sequence of Definitions

1. First list the meanings of the character in its single form

2. Second, list the combinations

   A. First list combinations starting with the main character *shu* - ; these combinations are arranged according to the number of strokes of the character following *shu*. Use arabic numerals to indicate the number of strokes.

   B. Second, list combinations in which shu comes second - ; then -- ; and so forth.

   The combinations are not grouped in reference to the functions of the main character;~~hz~~ thus students do not have to ascertain the function of a character before locating it in the list.

IV. Minimal List of Combinations

Need not list an item when its meaning is clearly derived from the meaning of the individual characters, e.g. *shu-tien* (book-shop)

V. Ways of Indicating Function Categories

Use abbreviations, e.g., *n* for noun, *v* for verb, etc.

VI. Miscellany

For nouns, include measure words, as they are useful information to students.

Include ways for students to easily identify and secure information or simplifie characters of Mainland China.

ATTACHMENT G

by N. G. D. Malmqvist
Institute of Oriental Studies
University of Stockholm

Random remarks on the dictionary project:

1. The dictionary should not aim at supplanting existing dictionaries, but rather to serve as an intermediary between the student and important lexical reference works. Part of the Introduction to the dictionary might therefore contain a description of and a handy guide to certain important lexica, such as Morohashi, *Dai kanwa jiten*, *P'ei-wen yün-fu*, *Tz'u t'ung*, *Tz'u hai*, *Kyo-yü tz'u-tien*, *Han-yu tz'u-tien*, *Shih-tz'u-ch'ü-yü tz'u-hui shih*, *Chung-kuo ch'eng-yü ta tz'u-tien*, *Grammata Serica Recensa*.

2. In view of the relatively poor lexical coverage of early vernacular texts it might be desirable to place a certain emphasis on this diachronic stage. A fair coverage of this field would naturally involve a great deal of lexical research on the part of the compilers. A humble beginning, however, could be made by incorporating part of the material from various Japanese studies of *pien-wen* 变文 texts (the titles of which are not available to me at the time of writing these notes), and from works such as the modern annotated editions of the *San-yen* 三言 collections, Hu Shih-ying's *Ku-tai pai-hua tuan-p'ien hsiao-shuo hsüan*, 1) the *Shih-tz'u-ch'ü-yü tz'u-hui shih*, 2) the *Tun-huang pien-wen tzu-yi t'ung-shih*. 3) This coverage would help to give the dictionary a profile of its own.

3. Under each entry should be given:

   (a) the abbreviated form of the character, if any;
   (b) romanization according to G.R., Pinjin and Wade-Giles;
   (c) the number of the radical and the number of additional strokes, as in Simon's *A Beginner's Chinese-English Dictionary*;
   (d) the *four corner* cipher of the character;
   (e) the phonetic series, under which the character is found in the *Grammata Serica Recensa*;
   The addition of the rime category of the character would no doubt facilitate the student's use of unindexed reference works arranged according to rime. A table of the 107 rimes would then have to be given as an appendix.
   In order to make the dictionary maximally useful to students and research workers alike reference may also be made to Karlgren's *Glosses* and to his *Loan characters in pre-Han texts*, an index to which work will be published in the next issue of

---

1) 胡士瑩 古代白話短篇小說選

2) 詩詞曲語辞匯释

3) 敦煌变文字義通释

the BMFEA.

4. If the dictionary is to cover both classical, literary, older vernacular and modern usage, it is important that different diachronic stages be clearly kept apart. Ideally each sample drawn from other than modern texts should be provided with reference to work or author.

5. The dictionary should include fairly detailed information concerning the grammatical functions of each entered form. The same frame would have to serve all diachronic stages. Chao Yuan Ren's categories (A Grammar of Spoken Chinese, pp. 678-9) would serve admirably. The main divisions under each entry should be according to grammatical function, rather than according to diachronic development.

6. Grammatical function words should be given full treatment in a separate compendium, which should include an extensive bibliography of all important reference works, books and articles in the field. For the function words of modern Chinese reference could be made to Chao's A Grammar of Spoken Chinese. The discussion of the function words of earlier linguistic stages should contain detailed references to relevant handbooks, monographs and articles. Full references to this Compendium should be contained in the dictionary.

First sample

諸 诸 ju/zhu/chu 149.9/0466.0/45/6

Compendium x.1 - x.10

1. D all; the various (cl., lit.), 諸侯 juhour feudal lord[s]; 諸夏 jushiah the various Chinese states [as opposed to barbarian nations]; 諸多 juduo a great many; 諸宮調 jugongdiaw 12th century medlay of prose and verse for recitation to instrument accompaniment;

2. D other (o.v.); 諸餘 juyu the rest; for the rest; in all respects; altogether (o.v.); 諸處 juchuh elsewhere; everywhere (o.v.), cf *Shih-tz'u ch'ü-yü tz'u-hui shih*, pp. 710-711, and *Tun-huang pien-wen tzu-yi t'ung-shih*, pp. 181-183;

3. N loan for 菹 jiu preserves, 桃諸梅諸 taur ju mei ju preserves of walnuts and plums (li); cf Karlgren, *Loan characters*, gl. 179;

4. P fusion of 之 jy and 於 iu (ȶi̯əg + i̯o = ȶi̯o), 子張書諸紳 Tzyy-jang shu ju shen Tzu-chang wrote it down on his sash (lun);

5. P fusion of 之 jy and 乎 hwu (ȶi̯əg + g'o = ȶi̯o), 天其或者將建諸 tian chyi huoh jee jiang jiann ju may it be that Heaven is about to establish him? (Tso);

6. P 其諸 .... 與 chyi ju .... yu? Could it perhaps be that ...? 其諸君子樂道堯舜之道與 chyi ju jiuntzyy leh daw Yau Shuenn jy daw yu? Could it perhaps be that the Superior man

took pleasure in discussing the way of Yao and Shun? (Kung);

7. P final particle, 日居月諸照臨下土 ryh jiu yueh ju, jaw lin shiah tuu Oh sun, oh moon, you shed light over the earth below (shih); Karlgren, gl. 75;

8. P adverbial suffix, 齊齊乎其敬也，愉愉乎其忠也，勿勿諸其欲其饗之也 chyi chyi hwu chyi jing yee, yu yu hwu chyi jong yee, wuh wuh ju chyi yuh chyi sheang jy yee correctly they showed their respect, joyfully they expressed their loyalty, intensely they wished that [the spirits of the dead] would enjoy the offering (Li);

9. P = 者 jee, 或諸遠人乎 huoh ju yuann ren hwu? or would perhaps [the spirits] keep far from men? (Li);

10. P = 於 iu, 莫近諸春秋 moh jinn ju Chuen chiou no other [work] comes closer to this than the Ch'un-ch'iu (Kung).

Second sample

書 书 shu/shu/shu 73.6/5060.1/45/6

1. V to write (cl., lit.), 書於竹帛 shu iu jwu bor to write on bamboo and silk (Hsün); 1957年書於北京 1957 nian shu yu Beeijing written in Peking in 1957;

2. V to record (cl., lit), 何以書 her yii shu? on what account was this recorded [in the Ch'un-ch'iu]? (Kung); 書不時也 shu bu shyr yee [The Ch'un-ch'iu]? records the event as untimely (Tso); 書法不隱 shu faa bu yiin the historiographical rules

do not allow concealment (Tso);

3. N element of script (cl., lit.), 六書 liow shu the six elements of script;

4. N style of writing, 草書 tsao shu cursive characters;

5. N writing; script (cl., lit.), 書不盡言 shu bu jinn yan writing does not give full expression to speech (Yi, Hsi-tz'u);

6. N calligraphy, 書畫 shuhuah calligraphy and painting;

7. N written documents, 畏此簡書 wey tsyy jean shu we fear these bamboo-slip documents (Shih);

8. N letter (cl., lit.), 叔向使詒子產書 Shwu-shiang shyy yi Tzyy-chaan shu Shu-hsiang dispatched someone to deliver a letter to Tzu-ch'an (Tso); 報任安書 Baw Ren An shu [Ssu-ma Ch'ien's] letter of reply to Jen An; (Han Shu);

9. N book (M 本 been volume; 部 buh set);

10. Nr canonical literature (cl., lit.), 五書 wuu shu The five canonical texts; 四書 syh shu The four books;

11. Nr The Book of Documents; 書云 shu yun it is said in the Book of Documents;

……

N:a/h 書目 shumuh book catalogue; index; 書生 shusheng student (o.v.);

N:a/h 書法 shufaa calligraphic skill; historiographical rules;

N:a/h 偽書 weyshu forged books; 叢書 tsongshu reprint series of books;

V:a/h 書寫 shushiee to write; to commit to writing; 書問 shuwenn (lit) to make a written inquiry;

V:v/o 書空 shu kong to draw characters in the air; 書春 shu chuen to write spring couplets;

V:v/o 說書 shuo shu to narrate written tales.